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1) PROJECT SUMMARY

The National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC) in cooperation with The District of Columbia Public Library (DC Library) is proposing to renovate/rehabilitate the Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Memorial Library located at 901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC (Figure 1). The proposed action would rehabilitate and modernize the MLK Memorial Library to provide a world-class and sustainable central city library. The project is needed because deferred maintenance has resulted in deficient building systems that do not meet current standards, the library does not meet the expectations of modern day library users, and the DC Library needs to ensure the long-term viability of the MLK Memorial Library.

The DC Library has determined the following to be requirements of a 21st century central library:

- Open floor plan that includes clear and well defined horizontal and vertical circulation;
- Flexible interior and exterior spaces that promote collaboration and innovation, and that enhances library programming;
- Destination spaces distributed throughout the facility to promote user movement; and
- Connectivity to the city visually.

To meet the above purpose and need and ensure the long-term viability of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library, the project may include the construction of additional space for non-library uses through the use of a public-private partnership.

2) PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS SUMMARY

Public involvement and participation is an essential element of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) processes by engaging citizens in the decision-making process through planning and development. NEPA regulations require an “early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.” To determine the scope of issues to be analyzed in depth in the EA for the project, a scoping period from September 17, 2014 through October 31, 2014 was announced by NCPC. NCPC announced the public scoping period for the project via electronic mail on September 17, 2014 to community groups and individuals (Appendix A). The DC Library also issued a press release on their public website announcing the project (www.dclibrary.org/mlkfuture) and on NCPC’s website (Appendix B). The email announcement and press release provided a project overview and invited the public to attend a public scoping meeting on October 7, 2014 at the MLK Library. Members of the public were invited to submit comments on the project electronically through the NCPC website and by mailing written comments to NCPC.
a) Public Scoping Meeting

On October 7, 2014 a public scoping meeting was held at the MLK Memorial Library. The meeting provided a forum for the project team to present the proposed action to the public and explain the NEPA and NHPA processes. The meeting began at 6:30 pm and continued until 8:30 pm. Meeting attendees were provided a brief overview of the meeting format as they signed-in upon arrival. The meeting began with a presentation outlining the NEPA/106 process and the various potential alternatives for renovating the MLK Memorial Library (Appendix D). After the presentation concluded, the audience was given an opportunity to ask questions. The meeting was then opened up to an open house format with informational displays so meeting attendees could investigate the project in further detail. NCPC, DC Library and consultant staffs were on hand to address additional questions and receive public comments. Comment forms were made available at the meeting and a court reporter was on-hand to record the oral testimony of meeting attendees (Appendix F).

A total of twenty-seven (27) individuals signed-in at the public scoping meeting (Appendix E). Three (3) verbal comments were given to team members at the scoping meeting and one (1) formal written comment was provided by the public at the meeting (Appendix G). Based upon the oral testimony received at the scoping meeting, the public in attendance asked questions regarding the range of alternatives, the architectural program, the design of the building, and

Figure 1: Project Area
the use building that honors the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The following is the summary of the verbal comments and testimony received during the public meeting.

- The Library should consider placing solar panels on the roof the building, the whole building, and when they are producing peak power, ask Pepco for reimbursement payments for the energy the library is generating.
- There should be a replica of the Edmund Pettus Bridge to walk over as you enter the building to commemorate the March 7, 1965 Selma-to-Montgomery civil right march.
- Use one of the pulpits or podiums from which Dr. King delivered a famous speech.
- Audience member did not want the presentation that was presented at the meeting posted on NCPC’s website.
- Audience members would like all comments from previous meetings posted on the project website.
- In favor of removing yellow brick wall surrounding the building – the wall was not the original plans by Mies.
- Audience would like DC Library to explore an additional alternative to extend building by repeating the existing building envelope.
- Audience member against mixing incompatible uses with the library, such as residences and offices.
- Audience member stated the combination residential and library uses are compatible uses.
- Audience member asked about the state of the funding for the project.
- Several audience members requested the components of the architectural program.
- Audience member wanted to know how the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was going to be honored with the renovation.
- Audience member wanted their voice to have weight in the decision-making process.

b) Nature of Comments Received

A total of ten (10) written comments were received after the public meeting (Appendix H). Generally, the correspondence received was in support of the renovation to the MLK Memorial Library. The comments received can be divided into four categories – range of alternatives, design, building use, and commemoration.

Range of Alternatives

- Explore additional alternative to extend building by repeating the existing building envelope (4 comments)
- Alternatives are not equal in size and function (1 comment)
- In favor of Alternative B – Rectilinear addition (1 comment)
- Not in favor of Alternative D – 3 story addition (4 comments)
- Need separate NEPA analysis for 3 story addition (2 comments)

Design

- Increase visibility, light, openness of building (4 comments)
- Remove yellow brick wall surrounding the building (2 comments)
- Remove bike kiosk (3 comments)
- Do not use church garage for garage entry for the library (1 comment)
- Favor of loading dock conversion (2 comments)
- Incorporate green roof technology (1 comment)
- Use of Solar panels (1 comment)

Building Use
- Need to see architectural program of library to fully understand the need for additional space (4 comments)
- Use of 3-story addition (4 comments)
- Need public space in the library to foster learning and communication (3 comments)
- Not in favor of privatization (3 comments)
- Co-locate like-minded institutions (1 comment)

Commemoration
- Honor legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (3 comments)

3) COMMENT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Correspondence Count by Organization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Correspondence Distribution by State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A:

SCOPING ANNOUNCEMENTS
IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC FILE No. 7610

September 17, 2014

Dear Interested Party:

The District of Columbia Public Library (DC Library) is proposing to renovate and rehabilitate the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial (MLK) Library located at 901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC. The proposed project is subject to the review of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) under the National Capital Planning Act. NCPC will serve as the lead federal agency and work in cooperation with the District of Columbia Public Library (DCPL) to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the environmental impacts of a range of alternatives, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations of Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508); and the NCPC’s Environmental and Historic Preservation Policies and Procedures. Concurrently, NCPC will conduct consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

The purpose of the proposed project is to rehabilitate and modernize the MLK Library to provide a world-class and sustainable central city library. The project is needed because deferred maintenance has resulted in deficient building systems that do not meet current standards. Completed in 1972, the building’s major systems, including heating, cooling, plumbing, electrical, and elevators are outdated and need to be replaced. In addition, egress is inadequate and hazardous materials are present throughout the building and require remediation.

The project is also needed to meet the expectations of modern day library users and establish a truly 21st century central library for the District of Columbia. As the methods in which people use public libraries to navigate complex networks of information and convert that information into knowledge evolve, libraries have to adapt their operations and services accordingly. The DCPL has determined the following to be requirements of a 21st century central library:

- Open floor plan that includes clear and well defined horizontal and vertical circulation;
- Flexible interior and exterior spaces that promote collaboration and innovation, and that enhances library programming;
- Destination spaces distributed throughout the facility to promote user movement; and
- Connectivity to the city visually.

To meet the above purpose and need and ensure the long-term viability of the MLK Library, the project may include the construction of additional space for non-library uses through the use of a public-private partnership.
The DCPL has developed the programming for the library and proposes the following to renovate the building: rehabilitate the building’s exterior and interior landmarked spaces; enhance the exterior plaza and public space; introduce a mix of uses; improve accessibility and visibility throughout the building; upgrade existing systems; and address the needs of the neighborhood, residents, and visitors.

The following three alternative concepts in addition to the no-action alternative will be analyzed in the EA:

- Rehabilitation with 5th floor curvilinear roof design
- Rehabilitation with 5th floor orthogonal roof design
- Rehabilitation with 5th floor roof design and three story addition

NEPA requires a public process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying potential significant issues related to the proposed project. Issues under NEPA are concerns associated with impacts from current environmental conditions and operations, as well as concerns that may arise from the implementation of the proposed project.

The purpose of this letter is to notify members of the community, local and federal agencies, and other stakeholders of an opportunity to assist NCPC and the DCPL in identifying potential environmental issues. Your participation in this process is greatly appreciated. NCPC and the DCPL will accept comments concerning the scope of issues to address in the EA until October 31, 2014. Interested parties are also invited to participate in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. Comments received during the scoping period will be used to refine the alternatives and inform the EA analysis.

A public scoping meeting will be held on October 7, 2014, from 6:30 pm until 8:30 pm at the MLK Library located at 901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC. This public scoping meeting will be an “open house” format and will include a brief presentation at the start of the meeting. The presentation will start promptly at 7:00 pm and will include a discussion of the purpose and need of the project, proposed project alternatives, and issues to be analyzed in the EA.

Comments can also be submitted electronically on NCPC’s website at www.ncpc.gov under the public participation tab. Written comments may be mailed or e-mailed to:

Ms. Jennifer Hirsch
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, NW
North Lobby, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov
If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Jennifer Hirsch at jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marcel Acosta
Executive Director
National Capital Planning Commission
Good afternoon,

The District of Columbia Public Library is proposing to renovate and rehabilitate the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library located at 901 G Street, NW in Washington, DC. NCPC is announcing the start of the public scoping period for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The preparation of the Environmental Assessment will enable NCPC to evaluate and analyze the environmental impacts of the project and alternatives under consideration. Concurrently, NCPC will be conducting consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to take into account the effects of the project on historic properties.

Attached to this email is a letter announcing the scoping period and an invitation to a joint NEPA/Section 106 meeting that will take place on October 7, 2014 at the MLK Library from 6:30 pm until 8:30 pm. You are invited to provide comments and participate in this process. The public scoping period will be open until October 31, 2014. A link to provide comments is available on our website: www.ncpc.gov. Information will also be posted online regarding the alternatives under consideration in the coming weeks.

Information on the project can also be found on the DC Library website at: http://dclibrary.org/mlkfuture

If you have any questions or would like to update the contact information for your organization, please let me know.

Thank you,

Jennifer

---

Jennifer Hirsch
Federal Preservation Officer | Urban Design and Plan Review
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, N.W. | Suite 500
Washington, D.C., 20004 | 202-482-7239
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
Calendar Event

OCT 7

NEPA/Section 106 Meeting: MLK Library Renovation and Expansion
October 7, 2014 6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

WHERE

MLK Memorial Library
901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC
Map it | Nearest Metro Station

OVERVIEW
The District of Columbia Public Library is proposing to renovate and rehabilitate the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library located at 901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC. The proposed project will be reviewed by NCPC under the National Capital Planning Act as a District of Columbia project located in the Central Area. NCPC is the lead federal agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). NCPC will be preparing an Environmental Assessment for the project to fulfill the requirements of NEPA and will be conducting Section 106 consultation under NHPA concurrently.

NCPC will be holding a public scoping meeting on October 7, 2014 from 6:30 to 8:30 pm at the MLK Library. The meeting will be an "open house" format and will include a brief presentation at the start of the meeting. The presentation will start at 7 pm and will include a discussion of the purpose and need of the project, proposed project alternatives, and issues to be analyzed in the EA.
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APPENDIX C:
EMAIL DISTRIBUTION LIST
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<td><a href="mailto:ghawkins@dcwasa.com">ghawkins@dcwasa.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bechtol</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bechtoln@si.edu">bechtoln@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Passman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:passmj@si.edu">passmj@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Ballard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ballaam@si.edu">ballaam@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Park</td>
<td><a href="mailto:parks@si.edu">parks@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Reichley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reichleyri@si.edu">reichleyri@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Allen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rallen@si.edu">rallen@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Rudnick</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rudnick.barbara@epa.gov">rudnick.barbara@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Witherell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancy.witherell@gsa.gov">nancy.witherell@gsa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Porter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gary.porter@gsa.gov">gary.porter@gsa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stevens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.stevens@ussdhs.gov">james.stevens@ussdhs.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sarles</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsarles@wmata.com">rsarles@wmata.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ashe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jashe@wmata.com">jashe@wmata.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Magarelli</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.magarelli@dc.gov">john.magarelli@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Karadimov</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ikaradimov@dc.gov">ikaradimov@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fitch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mfitch@aiadc.com">mfitch@aiadc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bellinger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbellinger@asbrealestate.com">rbellinger@asbrealestate.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Darcey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdarcey@asbrealestate.com">jdarcey@asbrealestate.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cy Kouhestani</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cy.kouhestani@brookfield.com">cy.kouhestani@brookfield.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bevirt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.bevirt@brookfield.com">david.bevirt@brookfield.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Stehmer-Townsend</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melanie.stehmer-townsend@brookfield.com">melanie.stehmer-townsend@brookfield.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Salmi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erik_salmi@catholiccharitiesdc.org">erik_salmi@catholiccharitiesdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Burke</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tony.burke@catholiccharitiesdc.org">tony.burke@catholiccharitiesdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy J. MacWood</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nmacwood@gmail.com">nmacwood@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Gosswein</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sgosswein@aol.com">Sgosswein@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Maguire</td>
<td><a href="mailto:megmaquireconsultant@msn.com">megmaquireconsultant@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hawkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donhawkins@comcast.net">donhawkins@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hansen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephen.hansen1@gmail.com">stephen.hansen1@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Wingo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hwingo@dcchamber.org">hwingo@dcchamber.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Miller</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebecca@dcpreservation.org">rebecca@dcpreservation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Paden</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.paden@olbn.com">scott.paden@olbn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Millstein</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmillstein@douglasdev.com">pmillstein@douglasdev.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Witticome</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gerry@downtownndc.org">gerry@downtownndc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Maguire</td>
<td><a href="mailto:megmaquireconsultant@msn.com">megmaquireconsultant@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Lee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:llee@thememorialfoundation.org">llee@thememorialfoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dineger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jimdineger@bot.org">jimdineger@bot.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Suau</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsuau@historydc.org">jsuau@historydc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dunbar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edunbar@iit.edu">edunbar@iit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Merritt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:betsy_merritt@nthp.org">betsy_merritt@nthp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Nieweg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mieweg@savingplaces.org">mieweg@savingplaces.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Field Office</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfo@nthp.org">sfo@nthp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn Neuhaus</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jo-ann@pennquarter.org">jo-ann@pennquarter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pringle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpringle@pepco.com">jpringle@pepco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Davis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ardavis@pepco.com">ardavis@pepco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Carino</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ncarino@pepco.com">ncarino@pepco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renante Aclan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rcaclan@pepco.com">rcaclan@pepco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Saliga</td>
<td><a href="mailto:psaliga@sah.org">psaliga@sah.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Jacobs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamjacobs@hotmail.com">jamjacobs@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren McHale</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loswalt25@aol.com">loswalt25@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Monsignor Salvatore A. Criscuolo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@saintpatrickdc.org">office@saintpatrickdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Grace Fischer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marygracef@thinkfoodgroup.com">marygracef@thinkfoodgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben E. Rodriguez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodriguez@washgas.com">rodriguez@washgas.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Mr. Vincent C. Gray</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eom@dc.gov">eom@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Mendelson, Chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmendelson@dccouncil.us">pmendelson@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A. Catania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcatania@dccouncil.us">dcatania@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Orange</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vorange@dccouncil.us">vorange@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Grosso</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgrosso@dccouncil.us">dgrosso@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Bonds</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abonds@dccouncil.us">abonds@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Graham</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgraham@dccouncil.us">jgraham@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary M. Cheh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcheh@dccouncil.us">mcheh@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyan McDuffie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmcduffie@dccouncil.us">kmcduffie@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette M. Alexander</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yalexander@dccouncil.us">yalexander@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Evans</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jevans@dccouncil.us">jevans@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel Bowser</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbowser@dccouncil.us">mbowser@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Wells</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twells@dccouncil.us">twells@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Barry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbarry@dccouncil.us">mbarry@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Dudley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lauren.dudley@mail.house.gov">lauren.dudley@mail.house.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Harvey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harvey@intowner.com">harvey@intowner.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Edwards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmnicus@gmail.com">pmnicus@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george.williams2@dc.gov">george.williams2@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Ivery</td>
<td><a href="mailto:librarygirlsrock@gmail.com">librarygirlsrock@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:archie.williams@dc.gov">archie.williams@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Jester</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tjester@quinnevans.com">tjester@quinnevans.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Archer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carcher@gilbaneco.com">carcher@gilbaneco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Greene</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgreene1@umd.edu">dgreene1@umd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Gillespie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgillespie9@gmail.com">sgillespie9@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Otten</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dclibrarydynamo@rushpost.com">dclibrarydynamo@rushpost.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Morris</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vsmorris@gmail.com">vsmorris@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Carpenter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akcpntr@gmail.com">akcpntr@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Lawrence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lincoln.lawrence@clarkconstruction.com">lincoln.lawrence@clarkconstruction.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Kou</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Koupeter262@gmail.com">Koupeter262@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Garber</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dggarber@gmail.com">dggarber@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Vanderwerff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matt.vanderwerff@gmail.com">matt.vanderwerff@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Berman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mberman@his.com">mberman@his.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Layman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:raymandc@yahoo.com">raymandc@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Fowler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sidfowler@comcast.net">sidfowler@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Wilkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wilkinsd@si.edu">wilkinsd@si.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK Library Friends</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@mlklibraryfriends.org">info@mlklibraryfriends.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Clinton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.clinton@brookfield.com">anne.clinton@brookfield.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tinpe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtinpe@gmail.com">jtinpe@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Abdul-Rahim (Jack Evans office)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wrahim@dccouncil.us">wrahim@dccouncil.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Bleyer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marc.bleyer@dc.gov">marc.bleyer@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Otten</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisotten2@yahoo.com">chrisotten2@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. MEMORIAL LIBRARY
RENOVATION PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND CULTURAL RESOURCES (SECTION 106) CONSULTATION
WELCOME
TONIGHT’S AGENDA

• Welcome/Introductions
• Purpose of Meeting
• National Environmental Policy Act Overview
• Section 106 Overview
• Concept Alternatives
• Next Steps and Timeline
• Open Discussion and Comments
PURPOSE OF TONIGHT’S MEETING

• The purpose of this meeting is to gather early public input on the scope of the study, potential alternatives, and areas of concern.
• This evening’s meeting is an “Open House,” during which you will be able to talk directly with members of the NCPC/DC Public Library project team.
• You are encouraged to provide your thoughts and ideas in writing or with a stenographer.
PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

PURPOSE:
To rehabilitate and modernize the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library to provide a world-class and sustainable central library

NEED:
• Deficient building systems do not meet current standards
• Meet the expectations of modern day library users and establish a truly 21st century central library for the District of Columbia
• Ensure long-term viability of library
The Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library is located at 901 G St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

The project area is bounded by 9th & 10th streets.
Project Overview/

About the MLK Library Building

- The Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library designed by modernist architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe was designated an historic landmark in 2007.
- DC Public Library is exploring ways to renovate and modernize the building to meet the needs of D.C. residents.
- Concept level designs have been developed and are presented tonight.
- NCPC acting as the lead agency, in cooperation with DC Public Library, have initiated work on an Environmental Assessment (EA) and the Section 106 review to evaluate the impacts of these designs.
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) established a national environmental policy and requires Federal agencies to consider the impacts of their proposed activities, programs, and projects on the environment.

Federal actions covered by NEPA include actions taken directly by the federal government as well as actions such as the Martin Luther King Jr. Library renovation that require federal approval.

NEPA requires the Federal government to disclose and consider the effects of major Federal actions on the human environment.

NEPA provides a means to comply with a multitude of Federal environmental laws and regulations.

NEPA is largely procedural.

NEPA is often used in litigation to stop or stall Federal projects.

Requires decision-makers to be informed.

Process must be completed BEFORE work is initiated.
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)

1. Initiate Project
2. Public Scoping
3. Purpose and Need
4. Alternatives Development
5. Historic Properties (Section 106) Evaluation
6. Environmental Assessment
7. Public Review
8. Final EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (if appropriate)
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES & IMPACT TOPICS

- Traffic and Transportation
- Scenic Resources/Viewsheds
- Historic Structures and Districts
- Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials
- Land Use (public space, building use, planning policies, socioeconomics)
- Storm water
- Utilities
- Energy
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) REGULATIONS

• Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. Part 800) require federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions (“undertakings”) on historic properties.

• Historic properties are any buildings, structures, objects, sites (including archaeological sites), and districts listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

SECTION 106 CONSULTATION

• Consultation is the process of seeking, discussing, and considering the views of other “consulting parties,” who are invited to participate in the process.

• Consulting Parties include the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), local elected representatives, other interested parties, and the public.

• The purpose of consultation is to identify historic properties, assess adverse effects, and resolve those adverse effects through avoidance, minimization, and mitigation strategies.
We are here

**National Historic Preservation Act**

- Define the Undertaking/Initiate Section 106
- Identify Consulting Parties
- Involve the Public
- Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE)
- Identify Cultural Resources within the APE
- Assess Effects on Significant Resources
- Apply Criteria of Adverse Effect
- Continue Consultation
- Draft an Agreement Document, if needed
DRAFT AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT (APE)
Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library
Washington, D.C.

**MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. PUBLIC LIBRARY**

- Designed by celebrated Modernist architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe.
- First memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in D.C. following his assassination.

**HISTORIC DESIGNATION**

- Designation included the building exterior, surrounding plaza, and the interior public spaces on the building’s first story.

**DESIGN GUIDELINES**

In 2012, the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board adopted a set of Design Guidelines created by DCPL and the D.C. Historic Preservation Office to guide the future maintenance and stewardship of the library.
Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library
Washington, D.C.

A
NO ACTION - EXISTING LIBRARY

B
RENOVATION WITH 5TH FLOOR RECTILINEAR EVENT SPACE

C
RENOVATION WITH 5TH FLOOR CURVILINEAR EVENT SPACE

D
RENOVATION WITH 5TH FLOOR CURVILINEAR EVENT SPACE + 3 STORY ADDITION
Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library
Washington, D.C.
Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library
Washington, D.C.
## Schedule/Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Tonight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Public Scoping Period</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Preparation of Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Public Comment Period</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 Consultation</td>
<td>Fall 2014-Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Decision Document</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Tonight:
Write your comments on the comment cards provided or provide them to the stenographer.

Submit comments electronically:
www.ncpc.gov or jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Submit written comments to:
National Capital Planning Commission
Attn: Jennifer Hirsch
401 9th Street, NW Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Johnson</td>
<td>202-333-4880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnsonwjd2@gmail.com">johnsonwjd2@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Dienner</td>
<td>214-31-9254</td>
<td><a href="mailto:riediens@gmail.com">riediens@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Barney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BURKE@INTOWNER.COM">BURKE@INTOWNER.COM</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Edwards</td>
<td>212-355-2845</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prmc088@gmail.com">prmc088@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Williams</td>
<td>202-229-1184</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george.williams2@dc.gov">george.williams2@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lopez-Crivlin</td>
<td>202-591-4056</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.crivlin@dc.gov">richard.crivlin@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Ivey</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:library.girlsrock@gmail.com">library.girlsrock@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggie Evans</td>
<td>202-727-1487</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meggie.evans@iqw.com">meggie.evans@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie E. Williams</td>
<td>202-591-5537</td>
<td><a href="mailto:archie.williams@iqw.com">archie.williams@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOH Jaster</td>
<td>202-398-1334</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johjaster@gmail.com">johjaster@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Padern</td>
<td>202-333-1334</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.padern@dc.gov">scott.padern@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Gosswein</td>
<td>202-375-4422</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stgosswein@iqw.com">stgosswein@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Archer</td>
<td>202-316-0411</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clare.archer@iqw.com">clare.archer@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Greene</td>
<td>202-688-7487</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgreene@iqw.com">dgreene@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Gillespie</td>
<td>202-629-4017</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgillespie9@gmail.com">sgillespie9@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ofen</td>
<td>202-310-2768</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.ofen@iqw.com">chris.ofen@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAUN DETTMAN</td>
<td>214-382-7767</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shaun.dettman@iqw.com">shaun.dettman@iqw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
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MR. REYES-GAVILAN: Good evening, everyone.

My name is Richard Reyes-Gavilan. I am the executive director of the D.C. Public Library. I want to thank you all for coming to this meeting tonight. I want to thank NCPC, the National Capital Planning Commission, for hosting this event here at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library. I am really excited about this process, especially excited about kicking off this process here tonight at MLK. I don't want to put too much pressure on anyone, but I have told many people that I uprooted my entire family and my entire existence to move to Washington, D.C. about seven months ago just to work on this project. So it is great to see so many of you here to learn about the process and see how it has been evolving very, very slowly over time.

Quickly I want to recognize a few people: The MLK advisory panel that has been put together to begin sort of shepherding this process for us. We have got I believe five members here. Stewart, where
are you? Meg? Robin? Jo-Ann? And Susan Haught? So the five of you, if you wouldn't mind just standing up, I want to recognize all of you for all of the time that you have put in on a voluntary basis --

(Applause.)

MR. REYES-GAVILAN: -- to help us think through this enormously complex but such a worthwhile project. Ultimately what we want to do here is very, very simple. And that is to build the most incredible central library that this country has ever seen and do it in a way that is respectful to the design of this landmark building and to be respectful to the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the architect, of course, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe.

So I will keep my comments -- I will end them there. I want to turn the microphone over now to NCPC. Jennifer Hirsch will take over now and will walk you through the program. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HIRSCH: Can you all hear me? If any of you want to move up closer to be able to see the screen, you can do that. There are lots of seats here
Again, my name is Jennifer Hirsch. I am the preservation officer at the National Capital Planning Commission. I want to welcome you all tonight. Thank you all for coming out for the NEPA scoping and first section 106 meeting.

I am just going to quickly walk you through tonight's agenda and say a few words about NCPC for those of you who may not be familiar with our agency. Essentially tonight we are going to walk you through the purpose of the meeting, give you an overview of the National Environmental Policy Act as well as section 106 and the National Historic Preservation Act. We are going to review the concept alternatives that we put forward for the MLK library renovation. You will have an opportunity to look at the boards that are around the room and talk to the architects who are working on the design. And then we are going to review the timeline and the next steps in both the NEPA and the 106 process and give you a general idea of where we will be going from tonight forward and then open it up for your discussion and comments and
We will do our best to answer any of your questions here tonight, but, again, tonight's purpose is really to kick off the environmental review process and the section 106 process and to start introducing you all to the project from NCPC's perspective and get open feedback on the alternatives that are being considered and what are the issues that we should address as we move forward.

So quickly while this diagram is up, I will just say a few words about NCPC's background. Many of you in the room I think are familiar with the agency. Essentially NCPC was formed in the early 1920s. Congress essentially recognized the importance of Washington for the nation and the capital. And this role that the federal government would have in terms of the physical development of the city and the region itself. And so NCPC was formed essentially to oversee the federal planning in the city and the region.

And then in the 1950s, essentially Congress passed the National Capital Planning Act, which essentially gave the authorities that NCPC as it
exists today has. Really, our mission is to preserve and protect the national and cultural resources that are so important and unique to the city itself and the region. And so essentially in the '50s, when they passed the Planning Act, there were three primary areas. One of those is the urban design and plan review function. So we oversee both federal development in Washington and the region but also District of Columbia development. And so that is why NCPC is involved with the MLK renovation project as a District building located in a particular area that we refer to as the central area. Essentially, NCPC has approval authority over the project.

So there are other functions at NCPC, including drafting of the comprehensive plan, which, you know, NCPC is responsible for the federal elements and then the District is responsible for the District elements. And together those make up what is the comprehensive plan for the national capital. So I work in the Urban Design and Plan Review Division at NCPC. And so our main responsibility is reviewing the federal project as
well as the District projects. And so because of that, as I mentioned, we have approval authority. We are required to comply with these two federal laws: The National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. So I am not going to go into two much more detail about either one of those. I am going to leave that to the consultants to walk you through. But I just wanted to give you that sort of overview as to why NCPC is getting involved at this point.

You know, we do want to acknowledge all the work that the library has already done, the project to date, work with the advisory panel, and all the community meetings that have been had. So, you know, we are hoping to build upon that work as we move forward through the environmental review process and take into account the impacts of the project.

Then the other thing I wanted to mention was NCPC is not the only regulatory agency that will be involved in the project. Many of you may be familiar with the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. They are another federal agency that has review authority over
the project in terms of the design and aesthetics or
that is usually what the Commission of Fine Arts
focuses on when they review projects, the design and
aesthetics of a project; whereas, NCPC is a little
more focused on the planning aspects of a project.

Then, finally, for local preservation
review, there is the Historic Preservation Review
Board. And because this building is a D.C. landmark,
the project is also required to be reviewed by HPRB.
And so essentially all three of these review processes
we try to coordinate and have them work together as
our development and review project moves forward. So
that is our goal, to coordinate the NEPA and the
section 106 review process with the review of NCPC as
well as CFA and the Historic Preservation Review
Board.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

MS. HIRSCH: And so, with that, I think I
have already gone over the purpose of tonight's
meeting is essentially to gather further input on the
range of alternatives that are being considered for
the library's renovation, whether you have input on
the alternatives or the environmental topics that we should be considering as we move forward. That is what we are here to get your input on tonight.

The meeting is structured as an open house format. This presentation will probably be about 25 minutes or 30 minutes. And then you will have an opportunity to walk around the room, look at the boards, talk to either myself or architect staff and the consultants working on the NEPA and the 106 work.

And then after tonight's meeting, all of this information will be posted on our website. And you will have the opportunity to -- you can either provide comments tonight with the court reporter or in writing. There are comment cards in the back or if you would like to go home and think about it and then write something, send it via our website, where you can email me at a later date. Essentially the public comment opportunity on the EA is open at this point until October 31st.

So, with that, I am going to turn it over to Liz Estes from Stantec. And she will walk you through a little bit more about the NEPA process.
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OVERVIEW

MS. ESTES: Good evening, everyone. Right now I wanted to take the opportunity to go over the National Environmental Policy Act. And then my counterpart will go over the National Historic Preservation Act for you all. We are taking on this project, as Richard mentioned, to rehabilitate the Martin Luther King Library to provide everyone a world-class library that is a sustainable library. This project is needed I am sure a lot of you are aware because the building systems are deficient and do not meet current standards. In addition, the library program does not meet the expectations of modern-day library users and we want this library to be the Twenty-First Century central library for the District of Columbia. Finally, we want to make sure that the library is sustainable throughout.

As everyone is aware, the project is located here: 901 G Street in Washington, D.C. And we are bounded by 9th and 10th Streets. The Martin Luther King Library was designed by modernist architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and was designated as an
The D.C. Public Library is exploring ways to renovate and modernize the building to meet the needs of D.C. residents.

We had worked through concept-level designs, which we will be going through tonight, which are provided along the wall to my right.

And, as Jennifer mentioned, NCPC is acting as the lead agency with the library as a cooperating agency. And this meeting is to initiate the section 106 processes as well as the NEPA process.

Some of you may not be aware, but the National Environmental Policy Act established a national environmental policy that requires federal agencies to consider the impacts of their proposed actions, activities, and programs, on the environment.

Federal actions that are covered by NEPA include actions taken directly by the federal government but also actions such as the renovation of the Martin Luther King Library that require federal approval, as Jennifer mentioned.

NEPA requires that the federal government disclose and consider the effects of their action on
the environment and on the human environment.

It provides a means to comply with a multitude of federal laws and regulations.

And it is largely a procedural law.

And it allows decision-makers to be informed so that they can make a good decision in going forward on their project.

This is an outline of the NEPA process.

Currently we are in the public scoping phase, which is approximately 30 days. During that time, you will have the opportunity to provide comments. As Jennifer mentioned, we do that tonight. We have a multitude of ways for you to do that.

From that, we will finalize our purpose and need statement and then finalize the alternatives, the concept that you see here tonight.

And then we will be writing our environmental assessment.

Then once that is written, there will be another public review period for approximately 30 days with that document that will allow you to provide comments as well.
Then at the end, a decision document will be made whether an environmental impact statement is needed or we will issue a finding of no significant impact.

Currently, based on the information provided, we have determined that some potential environmental impact topics that we will be looking at and considering: The traffic and the transportation in and around this area, the scenic resources and historic structures and districts and viewsheds. That will be a major component of this as well as different hazardous waste/hazardous materials. That will need to be looked at and how different things are going to be disposed of properly. We will also be looking at the land use, which will include the public space that we are in, how we are going to use the building as well as the socioeconomics in the area. We will also be considering storm water, the utilities, and also energy as well. That is not to say that this is an all-inclusive list, but these are potential ones that we are going to consider more thoroughly throughout our process.
I can turn it over to Bill to give you some information about the National Environmental Policy Act.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you go back to that slide before for just a second?

MS. ESTES: Certainly.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MS. ESTES: This one?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MS. ESTES: The presentation will be posted on NCPC's website. So you will be able to see it there. This is also on display board on this side.

Yes? Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question. What do you mean by the word "sustainable"?

MS. ESTES: So that it can continue in a sustainable environment to allow it to continue and so that it doesn't hurt or affect anything else, that it is allowed to sustain and continue on because right now there are building systems that can be affected and if they are not fixed, it is not a sustainable building, it is not going to continue, things like
AUDIENCE MEMBER: You are not talking about green issues.

MS. ESTES: Well, that is part of it, too, right, because you can make the green building as well. I mean, you can make the building more environmental friendly.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you go back a bit? Some of those topics, I mean, it seems like -- how would they be changed? I mean, traffic and transportation, it is a library and a field library.

MS. ESTES: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It is a library and a field library. I was wondering how you address items where there really is no change. In other words, a library has been here for quite some time. The transportation system is in place. It is going to be a library. You are not building six more stories. There is only so much square footage to the library.

How do you address issues where there are not or are very minimal changes?

MS. ESTES: Those are addressed in the EA as
well. And they could be dismissed if we find that
they have no impact. However, in regards to traffic
and transportation, depending on the concepts that we
are looking at right now, some of those may bring more
people to the site than currently are there now. So
we need to look at the impacts of more people coming
to the library than are currently here and take all of
that into consideration.

Yes, it is currently a library, and it will
stay a library. But renovating a library has the
potential to affect traffic and transportation once
you bring more people to the library than currently
visit it. So we need to look at the impact of that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You say that tomorrow you
are going to make these things public? Tomorrow?

MS. ESTES: Yes. This presentation will be
on NCPC's website.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So comments made tonight
will be made null, in effect?

MS. ESTES: No, they will not be. No. You
are allowed to comment tonight. And those comments
will also be taken into consideration. Oh, yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maybe the public segment tomorrow will have the advantage of the statement without our comments being pre-established and heard and figured into the equation. Could you take the whole step? Could you stop that and not broadcast it tomorrow on the internet? Because you are taking a bold step in the public view without comments from the public.

MS. ESTES: We are taking a step to post the presentation that we are presenting here tonight --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And?

MS. ESTES: -- on the website --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, a lot of the comments made --

MS. ESTES: -- so that everybody else who didn't have the opportunity --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- prior to tonight. And I don't see those comments presented in any of your presentments here. The other meetings that you had, I have attended some of them.

MS. ESTES: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I see no representation of
any of those comments in anything you have posted here. So why should this go on the internet without the effect of those comments being a priority?

MS. ESTES: All of those comments have been taken into consideration in designing the alternatives, in these alternative concepts that are out here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I am not going to actually point to one. Actually, I studied it closely.

MS. ESTES: Sure.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have seen words being represented and the comments made the last three public meetings --

MS. ESTES: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- on these postings here. You are going to take these postings and make them public. I have to protest that.

MS. ESTES: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't want to have to do that, but I have to protest.

MS. ESTES: That is fine. You have the
right to do that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That it not go up tomorrow, it not be posted tomorrow.

MS. ESTES: We will take note that you have protested that they not be posted. But they will be posted tomorrow so that the people who have not had the opportunity to come tonight and see this presentation, that they have the opportunity because we are currently in a public scoping period. That is for 30 days. That is open to everyone.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That is 30 days?

MS. ESTES: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It is not October 31st but 30 days? Is that?

MS. ESTES: No. Thirty days from when it was announced. So October 31st. And then if you have comments after that, we will continue to take comments or we will be moving forward with that analysis after the 31st.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You continue to make comments null and void. I take public issue.

MS. ESTES: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BONVECHIO: Before you get started, Bill, Jack Bonvechio from the library's Capital Project Office. Sir, you are referring to the meetings we had at Bellevue, Francis Gregory, and the West End community?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

MR. BONVECHIO: Those comments we will post on the MLK Library website. That will also reference to the NCPC website. So comments that we heard during what we are calling our road show meetings will be posted and will be made public. There just wasn't enough time to incorporate or list all of those comments prior to this meeting today. So they will be posted. Everybody will see all of the comments and questions that were asked at those road show meetings.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You are talking about architectural comments, presentations of the comments.

MR. BONVECHIO: Right. You know, we will have to work at how we are going to address architectural requests and ideas, but all of those comments and concerns will be posted on the library's website.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: There were some sketches offered up.

MR. BONVECHIO: Right. What I am saying is that we will post those on the library's website. I just don't have a timeframe of when we will get those up, but it will be up shortly. We documented all of the information and will post everything that we have collected.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you very much, but I feel that there is an unfair disposition being established on public opinion.

MR. BONVECHIO: We will make sure that that is addressed, and we will get every comment we have heard about this project up on our website.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Eventually? Not tomorrow?

MR. BONVECHIO: Well, as soon as we can, definitely within the October 31st deadline.

MR. MARZELLA: Well, thank you, Jack, and thank you, Liz.

SECTION 106 OVERVIEW

MR. MARZELLA: Good evening, everyone. My name is Bill Marzella. I am historic preservation
planner with EHT Traceries. I am here to speak very briefly about the section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Similarly to how Liz described the National Environmental Policy Act assesses the impact of federal actions on environmental resources, section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act assesses the impact of the effect that federal agencies have on historic resources due to their actions. Those actions we call undertakings. And, as Liz said and also as Jennifer said, because the proposed design requires approval from the National Capital Planning Commission, that is considered a federal undertaking for the purposes of section 106.

That review process is known as consultation, which is kind of a scary word, but it is really just the federal agency and other actors in that process seeking the input of the public and ways to identify historic properties, assess the effects of a project, and to identify appropriate preservation strategies for reducing or mitigating those effects. Usually this happens through a series of meetings with (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com © 2014
consulting parties. And consulting parties, it does include the public, but in general, it is a more focus group for stakeholders, who are I guess solicited and give their feedback at those meetings. As I said, the goal of those meetings is to identify historic properties, assess adverse effects, and resolve those effects.

So this is where we are in the project right now, which is to involve the public, which really means eliciting your feedback as well as eliciting feedback through the later consulting party meetings that will be happening throughout the fall and spring. And we have begun to address the next two steps, which are to define the area of potential effect and also to identify affected cultural resources and historic resources within that area.

So this is the draft area of potential effect as we have developed it, or, as we call it, APE in shorthand. Basically, the legislation and its regulations stipulate that the area of potential effect is a geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly alter the
character or use of historic properties. And so, as 
you can see here, the size and shape of this APE is 
really defined by the scale and specific nature of 
this undertaking.

So, working with D.C. Public Library and 
NCPC and the rest of the design team, we have 
established these boundaries, which will be finalized 
through consultation. And it is a little bit 
difficult to read on this map. You can see there is a 
blown-up version in the back there. And it is 
approximately bound by 13th Street on the west, 7th 
Street on the east, Eye Street on the north, and then 
E Street south. That boundary was really informed by 
views, both to and from the site, taking into 
consideration all of the alternative concepts that we 
have been working with.

So now that we have identified this draft 
APE, we can begin to assess effects of historic 
resources that fall within it. Obviously, the 
resource that we expect to have the greatest impacts, 
greatest effects is this building that we are in right 
now: Martin Luther King, Jr. Public Library. As was
described, it was listed in the D.C. Inventory of
Historic Work Sites and in the National Register of
Historic Places in 2007. The designation included the
building exterior; the surrounding plaza; and, of
course, this wonderful first story space that we are
in right now. So that assessment of effects will have
to take into consideration all of these aspects of the
building's designation.

To guide us through that process, our set of
design guidelines, which were developed subsequent to
the National Register and D.C. Inventory designations,
which were really intended to guide us through
maintenance and stewardship of this building.

So now I would like to pass the mike over to
Tom Johnson of Martinez and Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Bill.

CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES

MR. JOHNSON: I am Tom Johnson with Martinez
and Johnson. I just wanted to acknowledge my
colleagues: Leslie Alley. Michelle Rodriguez is here
somewhere. There she is. This is our North American
contingent of the Martinez and Johnson team. If you
look in the computer there, Mecanoo was following along with us as we go off in Holland. They did this during the World Cup. So they got some experience here.

I wanted to talk about the options here, the alternatives. There are four alternatives. You may think about this more as a matrix because there are elements and schemes that are interchangeable. They are not design scores. They are concepts at this point. As we have heard comments talking about specific questions here and there, right now we are looking at some very general parameters, basic building organizations, and basic building strategies.

Scheme A is doing nothing at all. If you look at what is on top of the building, a lot of people have never seen the roof of this building. There is a core. There are four core elements, partial bits of the core to come up. There are screen walls. And there is a suggestion of an enclosure up on the roof. Otherwise this is a freestanding building. And the 30 by 30 column grid is expressed on the exterior. You can see the first floor is
pulled back from the perimeter, creating a rosia around the building. And this is the character-defining features of this building and other Mies buildings.

Scheme B looks at the accommodation of the program of the Twenty-First Century library. One of the ways we have looked at achieving the program is to create a de facto fifth floor. In this case, we have looked at Scheme A. We have looked at the pieces that are up there and tried to kind of fill in and extend a little bit but to try to do it within the Miesian language to some degree. What we are looking at doing at the top of the building is mostly by creating a destination to start to irrigate the building, to give clues about why one wants to circulate beyond this first floor. There are these destination places. There are amenities. Is it a restaurant? Is it the top part of the theatre? Are they breakout spaces?

You have seen us, I believe, talk about many of these elements. They are all suggestions and possibilities. But this is probably the most
straightforward one in terms of projecting upward. Scheme C accomplishes many of the same programmatic criteria. It is a fifth floor addition, but it goes to the concept of a counterpoint. So you kind of look at the top piece and not have it be so rectilinear, so Miesian as we have -- I am not sure it is a real word, but it is a word that we have adopted over the last year -- and to do something that is a direct -- what is your word? I was trying to think of how to describe this. But it goes back to the Secretary's standards about doing something that is remarkably in contrast. The site lines will be the same. We will show you some of those site line studies in the concept drawings.

Scheme D uses the fifth floor that we were proposing on scheme C as a podium for a potential mixed-use addition. We won't talk about a program because we don't know what it will be, but we are looking at a complementary use to the library and different ways to get there and different ways to achieve it.

In scheme A, I will just point out a couple
of things that I am sure we have talked about before.
But they are consistent things with all of these
schemes, and they are incredibly important.
I think there are about 15 buildings in the
city that have the interior designation. We have
worked on about half of them, but this is one of them.
The main areas, the outside, of course, is protected,
but we are looking at the great hall, and we are
looking at these reading rooms and what we call the
plinth, you know, this entire area. The only areas
that don't really have the same level of protection as
some of these backup house areas with the loading
girth. But the entire public experience of the first
floor is a protected space.

We start to look at some views from the west
looking at it from the church; looking at it from
across 9th and G Streets; then, of course, 9th and G
Place. G Place is sort of a service street. And this
area looked very different in 1965, when the building
was first contemplated; and certainly in 1972, when it
was built.
The cores, the building is defined by these
core brick boxes in the building. These are the service cores that go through the building. And they and the glass walls and the steel columns in the grid of light fixtures. These are the features that you take home with you about what this building will be.

We come in here through the front door. We go in through the cores, which in this case have been projected out into the lower space. This is our first contact with Dr. King, in the vestibule. There is not really a clue as to how you get through the building or that there is anything happening on subsequent floors. You go in. There is an information desk. And we see the mural. It is actually a straight wall back there, but there is the mural of Dr. King and the civil rights movement.

There are granite floors inside the building. And they go right up to the sidewalk.

Again, this is what scheme A looks like in a little more detail.

This is what we are calling scheme B. We are looking at reprogramming the cores a bit, looking at what happens on G Place, maybe removing parts of
the wall, really starting to celebrate the three-
dimensional quality of the building, the transparency
of it. The impression of it, again, this is one that
is looking at doing an addition on the roof, a fifth
floor addition, but the viewshed from 10th and G or
from across G Street is largely the same. You are not
really aware from those points of view of what
happens.

There is some alteration that we are
proposing in the vestibule-type space. We are looking
at holding onto the strong brick walls, the one faces
entering the building, but to get some level of
transparency. We start to see stairs. We start to
see light. We start to become aware that there are
rooms below us and rooms above us and how we might get
to them. We are also looking at a concept out here of
looking at these five-by-five pavers but in this case
swapping some out for some translucent material,
whether it is glass, something that allows light. It
might allow visibility, but we certainly are trying to
get light down to a lower level and make it a more
active type of a space.
This might be the appearance of this space, what it could look like. Again, we think it is very low-impact and observes many of the Miesian principles, whether it has a grass roof or not. Scheme C picks up on a lot of these ideas. The cores we might handle a little bit differently. Looking in the rear of the building, if we do something on the roof to provide another level of entry, another level of more direct access, such that, say, it is a restaurant and the library closes at 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock at night, you know, that there is a way still to do that, there might be a public lecture on a Sunday morning if the library were closed that day. Anyway, it is just a matter of making the facility, giving those upper floors a little more flexibility.

There is an idea on the first floor that if we don't need so much service off of G Place, that we could maintain the amenity zone all the way around the building. It is kind of a park-like setting, picking up some of the energy from 9th Street, and to have a more direct connection of light on this kind of short
access. So, as soon as you come in the building, you see the mural, but you see light beyond. There is a space in there that can be connected to the grand space but can also be compartmentalized. It would just give us a lot of flexibility for increasing programming.

There is also an idea. And we keep looking for devices. This is the Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial Library. We are looking for different ways to make Dr. King more of a presence in the building.

One idea is to make the cores totally transparent and that we get to the same level of opaqueness but we use verbiage. We start to create a message on those walls. And this is something that one picks up from the street. You don't have to get into the lobby. You don't have to get into the great hall to start to experience those things. The vertical circulation that takes you up and down, it is right there in the open. You see this from the outside of the building. And, again, maybe those walls never really close up. Maybe they are glass walls in that and whatever space we create is always there, it is always...
available. And, again, maybe it is not quite so rectilinear. Maybe it is something that is a little more playful that creates more incidental spaces.

I am sorry. We were already at D. It is kind of looking at the viewshed. I guess we have already looked at that. But, again, we think that this will also have minimal impact from, you know, the 100-foot mark and the 200-foot mark as we walk our way around the building.

Scheme D is using that same element as a podium. It does have a little more impact. It is something that we celebrate in this. We have created a mixed-use element. It is something complementary, something compatible, you know, with the library. It also starts to build in the concept of financial sustainability, maybe for decades, just building in. We have also looked at other mixed-use components sprinkled throughout the library, the idea of having a café, having coffee bars, having other features as one goes through the building. It is just a different kind of experience than libraries that I grew up with.

This is an idea, just different domains.
This is the children's domain. This is an idea maybe of what this great hall could look like as it starts to engage G Street.

And then from above, the idea, it floats.

Not to get into the architecture too much today, but it is I think certainly inspired by late modern buildings. The actual form has to do with sort of a tension created by these corners and the rotation that has something to do with the views that come from the portrait gallery site. You know, these two streets that were sort of disposed differently, the grid was transformed to accommodate the portrait gallery as the old national church. It starts to create a very different -- it is not the same grid that we have elsewhere. And so we have a building that has a diagonal disposition to it. Again, it is setting back from the main viewshed, giving us a little more flexibility. Otherwise, the building, the actual Mies building, is largely unchanged in this view.

And that is kind of where we are. Again, I wouldn't focus on any one of these. We deliberately are creating alternatives. And the different ideas
about the cores are somewhat interchangeable. But they are really four very different attitudes, four very different approaches, to what might happen at this building.

Thank you.

NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

MS. ESTES: So, just to follow up, this slide talks about our project schedule right now for the environmental analysis. This night, we are at the public scoping meeting. We are anticipating the public scoping period to end October 31st. And then we will begin preparation of the environmental assessment. And that is going to take place through the rest of the fall and into the early part of December. We are looking to have a draft document out for everyone to review around December this year.

And then the section 106 consultation is ongoing. So it will continue from tonight all the way through to next spring.

And then for the scoping period, there are other ways, as Jennifer mentioned earlier, to comment. You are more than welcome to comment tonight. We have
a stenographer up here that you can give verbal
comments to. We have comment forms in the back, that
you can fill out a comment tonight and leave with us,
or you can take it. And the address is there to send
it back. There is a snail mail address as well as you
can email Jennifer. You can also go to NCPC's
website, and the project is there. And you can post
your comments there, too.

So right now we are going to turn it over to
see if anybody has any questions that they would like
to do right now. And then we will open it up for you
to walk around.

Just real quick, the displays are set up
such that alternatives A, B, C, and D are grouped
together, so they are not intermingled, to make it a
little easier.

Yes?

OPEN DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Two questions. The first
one is all the walls that we're looking at now, inside
those wonderful yellow brick walls -- it should have
been a road, but they are walls. Are they part of the
historic fabric that can't be removed or changed or if they are moved or changed, that they would require some amelioration?

And the second question is, what is your preferred alternative? Because, as I recall, that, at least in my day, doing equal fixes, you made your preferred alternative, and then there are other alternatives that you have. One is no change. And then you usually have to do one more.

So those are my two questions.

MR. MARZELLA: So I can answer the first part of that. The designation does not prohibit any changes to any contributing historic fabric to the building. What it does through the section 106 process is requires the library and NCPC to assess those effects and then provide options for minimizing, avoiding, or mitigating.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That is the first floor. Because you said the first floor, you didn't say the ground area, including the outdoor landscaping. You did say the plaza, but you didn't mention the wall. So I'm trying to find out if the wall is included in
what was listed as historic.

MR. MARZELLA: Yes. All of the exterior
spaces within this piece of property.

MS. HIRSCH: I'll take the second question.

So right now there is not a preferred alternative.

Our plan is to use the section 106 resulting party
process. We will be scheduling additional meetings
starting in probably early November, late November to
use the section 106 process to arrive at what would be
considered a preferred alternative and then advance
through a schematic design. So right now there is not
a preferred alternative at this moment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So does that mean that the
preferred alternative is a community, is a public
process and you are deciding at the library and there
aren't things from other sites?

MS. HIRSCH: No. I wouldn't characterize it
as that. It is a combination of considering the
public input as well as input of other stakeholders,
including other federal agencies, NCPC, CFA, HPRB. It
is going to be --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: A committee?
MS. HIRSCH: -- the combination of all of those things will factor into what becomes the preferred alternative.

MS. ESTES: And it will be ultimately, then, NCPC and the library will make the decision on the preferred alternative after they have received all of the input and things like that.

MEG: It's my understanding that Mies anticipated that there might be an addition and that the building was simply to go up as it is. Why is that not one of the alternatives?

MR. MARZELLA: That's a really good question. I think there was some effort on the part of the architects to assess the intentions of the original architects who designed the building and then eventually in its execution after Mies passed away. We are bound by the documentation of the building as it was eventually completed and the way that the designation materials were laid out, which specifies that its existing condition, its condition when finished is what contributes to its significance. So that is where the assessment was made from.
MEG: But you are not bound by just what exists when Mies died. If he had intended or anticipated another floor, that should be an alternative that we can comment on. I really find it odd that that has been omitted.

MR. MARZELLA: Thank you. We will take that into consideration.

MR. HARVEY: Tony Harvey with the InTowner newspaper. We have reported on the process of going forward with the adaptive reuses of the building. And at one of the large stakeholders' meetings, the Mecanoo, the Dutch architectural firm, showed slides that truly, truly electrified the group. And she and her staff had researched the original plans for the building and found that much of this, yellow brick walls and yellow brick front, was not part of the original plans, especially the large area behind the loading docks on G Place. And what it did for lightening the building and displaying, demonstrating the transparency of Mies' original plan was very, very captivating to the audience. So I pass that on. I understand the point of what was built is
what got landmarked, but that will be a real obstacle
to architectural plans on adaptive reuse of the
building that is in the extent to really create a
destination building. I pass that on.

MS. ESTES: Thank you.

CHRIS: Hi. My name is Chris. I am really
confused by this process. Maybe I just need more
information. You mentioned these alternative concepts
here. Who designed them? And when were they designed
would be my first initial questions on that?

And then I heard that there are consulting
parties. So who is in the consulting parties? And,
you know, what is the makeup of the consulting
parties?

And then I have a question about the land
use.

MS. HIRSCH: Sorry. We'll take the
questions a little out of order.

The consulting parties, it is a term that is
used in section 106, "consultation." And so
consulting parties, as broadly as Bill has explained,
can be anyone in the public as well as anyone who has
a particular interest. In the buildings, for example, perhaps the D.C. Preservation League will be a consulting party. The ANC may be a consulting party. Other federal agencies, local agencies, District of Columbia agencies. So it is a fairly broad term. It is essentially who is interested in the preservation of the property and wants to participate in the section 106 process is basically able to.

And then as far as the question I think about who did the designs, I think we would ask the library to address that. So Jack?

MR. BONVECHIO: The four or the three design concepts we are seeing plus the no-action alternative have been developed since the architect was hired back in February of 2014. The curvilinear design is just further exploring the design, the competition entry, submitted by Martinez and Johnson, Mecanoo. And then the other two alternatives are further developed based on the series of community meetings we had in April and May, in that timeframe, as well as in consultation with library staff to come up with how do we meet that library program of the Twenty-First Century. So they
have been developed, and they are still under
development, as Tom mentioned. Nothing is complete at
this time. That is why we are going through this very
long and thorough process to finalize the design on
the building.

CHRIS: See, that is what brings me to the
confusing part. Looking at these designs, what I saw
that this process is supposed to look at is impact
topics that include land use, utilities, and energy.
Now, depending what goes on top of this building, I
mean, it is not just a floor; right? It could be
offices that have thousands of computers. It could be
residents, what we heard. It could be residents with
washers and dryers and all sorts of other stuff that
you don't find in a library.

And that is what is confusing about this
because the last major public forum on this, you had a
great hall back, I believe, in May. You know, it was
pretty overwhelming, the discussion was overwhelmingly
against the idea of mixing incompatible uses with the
library, such as residences and offices. And we still
don't have any clarity in the public to determine what
the uses are for any of these alternatives. Is it going to be library use or is it going
to be some other use? And that is going to directly
impact your study on land use; correct?

MS. ESTES: You are right. It will impact.

And in each of the alternatives and how we discuss and
analyze them, we will look at all of those different
uses as a whole and see, you know. And those uses
will be determined as we move forward in the process.

So we will have an idea. And once you see the impact
analysis that we will write, you will see how those
different uses will have an impact on the environment
because, as you said, the computers, if it's
computers, office space, that -- and the same thing
with the traffic, as mentioned earlier. Depending on
the use that is here for the space as a library but
then mixed-use as well if that is the case, that could
have an impact. And that will be analyzed in the
document.

CHRIS: (Comments made away from
microphone.) Residential units, people were opposed
to that, almost unanimously. So what uses are we
talking about, public uses, you know, like a community college? I mean, that is the big rub in all of this. We want to know what is going on top of our library. Is it going to be a privatized residential office space or is it going to be something that matches the library public services or an educational facility? We need to know that before we go any further. And the public has been left out of that conversation.

MR. BONVECHIO: Chris, I think it is a very good comment. It is one of the things that we as a library are trying to figure out. I think this is a perfect forum for the community to tell us what sort of mixed-use options that would prefer to see in the library. We are not set on any of those options. It is an alternative that we are looking at, but, you know, as we have been talking about, this is the portion of the project where we seek public input.

There is a series of section 106 meetings. There are lots of opportunities are the community to say, "I would really think that a community college would be great on top of the library" or "I would think that the archives would be great on top of the
1 library." This is all part of the process.
2 So I think you brought up some good points
3 about community college and that sort of thing.
4 Again, it gets put into the comment process. And
5 those will be factored into how we study these
6 alternatives.
7 CHRIS: Just one last point on this issue.
8 MR. BONVECHIO: And then we will move on to
9 someone else.
10 CHRIS: Yes, please, because in May, it was
11 very clear the people that attended the meeting said,
12 "We need to touch base with all of the agencies in the
13 District of Columbia to see what their space needs are
14 to see if we can meet them on top of this library," a
15 public-public partnership. And we don't know if that
16 has been done. We don't know by the library. We
17 don't know how that has been integrated into any of
18 this conversation. It has not been told to the
19 advisory panel from what I know or anybody else in the
20 public. So that is a real issue here. And to be
21 going through a 30-day comment period before you start
22 going into schematic designs is way rushing this most
important part of the discussion. So I want to know if any outreach has been done, any of the public agencies, to see if they need space needs that could be met on top of our library.

MR. BONVECHIO: Yes. We have had discussions with other D.C. agencies. And those discussions are ongoing.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you say something about the state of the funding for this project independent of which plan is pursued? What is in place? How certain is this in terms of allocation of funds and something about the timetable?

MR. BONVECHIO: Sure. The current funding that we have for this project is $208 million. That is within the city's current FY '15 through FY '20 capital budget. There is approximately $14.5 million this year, this fiscal year, that just started at the top, October 1. It will run through September 30th.

That additional money will be used to work through the review and entitlement process as well as beginning to study alternatives for interim library services, which we know we need. Additional money,
the remainder of that $208 million, a small portion of it becomes available in 2017. And then the remainder of that money becomes available in 2019 and 2020. So the money is currently spread out, which if anyone knows anything about the District's budgeting process, that money is there, but until we move this project forward and are in place to spend it on construction, that money is at risk. So we are concerned. And that is why we are pushing the schedule because the important thing, as Rich mentioned, is we need to build a world-class library for the District of Columbia. And we are afraid if we wait until money and that sort of thing becomes more new or until 2019, that we will lose that opportunity. And we don't want to lose that opportunity. We will go to Stewart and then the gentleman --

MS. ESTES: Wrap it up. And you will have an opportunity to add comments.

STEWART: Thank you. I am still a little bit confused as to the process. And so we are going to keep drilling down a little bit.
MS. ESTES: Sure.

STEWART: I am hearing two conflicting messages. One is that we are going to be open to interchangeability, mixing and matching. Another is that we don't have a preferred alternative but we will be selecting one. And so that seems to indicate that one of these four is going to be selected and pushed. And, as Meg noted, one does not include Mies going up before, too. So can you explain a little bit at the end of the process what is happening?

MS. ESTES: Right. So right now, being in the scoping period, we are looking for feedback. And one of those comments is what Mies intended to go up. That information will be taken back and will be looked at. And then in the EA, we will analyze alternatives the same and equal. We won't be analyzing one more than the other. They will all be analyzed on an equal level. And then at the end of that process -- and there will be another public comment period -- a decision document will be made. And then that decision document will tell what alternative will be moved forward for construction.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: But is that alternative of adding two floors completely out of the question?

What you are saying is that either one of the -- excuse me. What you are saying that I hear is either one of these will be selected or some features from each of these will be combined and you will make that selection, but out of the question is anything because it has not been evaluated -- in other words, no EA has been done or --

MS. ESTES: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- no EAs will be done on adding the floors that were part of the original Miesian plans but were never built. So that becomes something that can't be done because it is not being considered because you didn't --

MS. ESTES: That is not what we are saying. We are not saying that we are not going to consider that. We are going to take the information that you are giving us tonight and look at whether that will meet our purpose and needs that we have. And that then will be spelled out in the document. If it doesn't, it will be an alternative to consider in
this, but if it does, then it will need to be
considered further.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But any selection in the
end could be any one of these alternatives or a
combination of features, as Tom Johnson described,
that they are interchangeable for the most part, the
concepts. And then they would have to be developed
into plans.

And I would just like to make one more
comment. I am an urban planner. And to say that
residential and a library are not compatible uses
would say that there are quite a number of newer
libraries in this country, not even to mention
anywhere else in the world, that have a combination of
those uses as well as libraries and office buildings.
And they can work very well together. You may not
want it here. And the 200 or so people who were at
the meeting may not have wanted it, in whole or in
part, but it is the complementary use. It is not
considered -- you know, if you want to put a sludge
plant on top, that would be not complementary, but
residential and office are considered complementary
with a library.

MS. ESTES: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have one last short question.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I am totally confused by this --

MS. ESTES: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- as everyone here knows because I have talked to everyone about being confused. We don't know what is going to go on top, if anything is going to go on top. We don't know how it will be funded. We don't even know if the city council would allow it. We don't know if there would be private funding to do it. I don't understand what you are evaluating.

MS. ESTES: We are going to be evaluating how to renovate and rehabilitate this building and what impact that will have on the environment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So when you say a decision will be made, that will be a decision about which of these versions --

MS. ESTES: Or whether that comes out
tonight. That could be a possibility, as you have heard.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So I don't get it.

MS. HIRSCH: Let me just also add to that -- sorry -- that, in addition to the environmental assessment that we are doing, which is to assess the environmental impact of the project, the project still, as I was describing in the very beginning, has to go through a review process in terms of getting approval from NCPC, approval from the Commission of Fine Arts, and approval from the Historic Preservation Review Board. So it is the environmental assessment that we are here tonight to discuss and show these alternatives and then consider your input. It is solely about the environmental impacts. But then on top of that, there will have to be a permitting and design review process. I just want to also emphasize that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So if I understand that --

MS. HIRSCH: The environmental assessment does not lead to a final decision.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's what we keep hearing.
It's the beginning. It's the beginning. It's the beginning. There have been countless meetings. I mean, I know this is a new aspect: the environmental. But what is the building that we are going on? What will it contain? What are the services it will provide? What is the program? I have never seen the program for the building. I feel that this is out of order.

I don't understand it. Sorry. But enough from me. Move on to the people who do understand it.

MS. ESTES: In NEPA, we can't just study one alternative that we are saying, "This is what we are going to move forward with." We have to look at a range of alternatives. And once we do that and once we have gone through all these different other review processes, it is a process. And we are at the beginning part of this process.

I know that is probably not what you want to hear, but that is where we are. And we are moving forward to get you more information so that you can understand what exactly will be here when the time comes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you very much. Part of a memorial is it factors all around, but I am not hearing any conversation about the memorial itself as it relates to Dr. King. Of $208 million, is there 2 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent? How much do you plan on spending? Is it all going to be simply programmatic sort of tour guide talk? Will there be some physical structure of the movement of Dr. King? Will it be like, for instance, a component in the great hall; Ebenezer Church, where he did a lot of his work at the podium, all over the country? Podium is representation of King. In the great hall, right underneath that placard out there, the memorial, it should be a podium that represents something that is a facsimile of Ebenezer Church, where, you know, he pastured at.

Those are the sort of things we are looking for and listening for. I am looking for that memorial component. And I am not hearing it. And I am not seeing where the public comments previously made about it or represented in the things here. I think there is a picture there that has
been there for 35 years in the cubic square feet of
this building. And there is no other talk about that.
So I am appalled that you are going forward with
presenting these things to the public without even
real solid-clad presentation of a memorial to Dr. King.

MS. ESTES: Thank you.

Last comment?

MR. HARVEY: Yes. The emphasis that I've heard reporting on this project has been that, in
addition to the redesign and the adaptive reuse plans,
you know, for a destination building, and the problem
that is absolutely considered necessary are the
activities that will occur in this new destination
building. And so I am asking a theoretical question
as well as follow-up with this gentleman's question
because the MLK aspect of it was emphasized time and
time again. You know, activities, like a lecture
series, like an archive to the civil rights movement,
like an annual prize book, that sort of thing,
something, but in all kinds of other areas.

So this is my question. How are you
factoring in the activities that would be supported by a redesign, adaptive reuse of this building, and let's say the complementary extension on the roof? How is that factored in to this bureaucratic process --

MS. ESTES: Right.

MR. HARVEY: -- that doesn't have obvious pigeonholes to --

MR. BONVECHIO: So it's very clear. And I conferred with some people here. One thing that needs to happen which I think will add some clarity to the process is that the library program that determined we needed the fifth floor to provide that 33 percent more public space that was talked about in May, that was up on our website. For some reason, it was removed. We are going to make sure tomorrow that the library program is up on the website.

That will describe exactly how much space is going to be devoted to the Black Studies Division, the Washingtonian Division, to the children's program. And, again, these are conceptual square footages that we are working with right now. And there is still a lot of input that is needed.
But I think what would be helpful is once we get that program up along with all the other comments that we received from the previous community meetings, that we will be able to shape a picture of what those services will be within the building that are driving the need for the square footages that are creating a fifth floor addition on the building's full library services. So we will be sure to get that up so that it is clear and as we continue these conversations to talk more about the programmatic elements that are in the building.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Comments made away from microphone.)

MR. BONVECHIO: Excuse me? On what?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Dollar value that you are dedicating to Dr. King would be --

MR. BONVECHIO: We have not determined a dollar value to what future programs devoted to Dr. King will have, but we have heard that comment about the importance of Dr. King's legacy as part of this building and having programs and exhibits or events that help people learn and understand about Dr. King.
And we are taking that into consideration. And we will have to continue working on what that starts to look like, what sort of partnerships we can form with other agencies, the Center for Nonviolence in Atlanta. There are a lot of organizations that we are looking forward to partnering with to meet that need that we have heard so clearly in the community about the legacy of Dr. King as associated with this building.

MS. ESTES: I just wanted to thank everyone for coming tonight. And the comments that you have provided here right now have also been recorded. So we do have those. If you want to provide additional comments, again, you can leave some with the stenographer. You can send them in via email or --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is the stenographer going to represent public opinion as this process goes on? Who is marshalling the public opinion in your process? Who is there making sure that (Comments made away from microphone.) I can't expect you to represent the public when you are somewhat apprehensive when we are opposing what you are doing and not doing for this
center. So who is there to sit on this board and these panels through these processes strictly for the public opinion and our words?

We are putting $208 million. This is our money. Our voice should have a weight that goes along with that kind of money and the importance of this building in the capital city. This is lacking. It is all being put on the shoulders of you people and with them saying that you have to wait to catch up our comments. That is telling me that you have been negative towards our comments. I want that fixed before you go any further.

MR. BONVECHIO: And the people with us, we did create the MLK advisory panel. There are five members of that advisory panel here this evening. They raised their hands at the beginning of the meeting. They can introduce themselves to you at the end of the meeting. But that is one of the goals of the advisory panel members, is to make sure that we are hearing from the community. They represent various organizations and agencies -- or not agencies but organizations within the city. They are from all
wards of the city. So there is representation in this process from the advisory board members. And I am sure that if we are missing something, that members of that advisory panel members will let us know that that is being captured.

As I understand it, the stenographer is taking a straight transcript of tonight's meeting.

MS. ESTES: That is correct.

MR. BONVECHIO: That will be posted. And, again, this is a process. It is not a process that is anywhere near finished. And there are lots of opportunities for input as we move through the process. And we are here for the next half-hour or so to talk one on one with people to ask specific questions for myself or any other member of the team that is working on this project.

So I would like to thank everybody. And we will be around to have more detailed, more in-depth conversations. So thank you.

(Whereupon, at 8:10 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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Comment Form

All comments must be post marked by October 31, 2014

Mail to: National Capital Planning Commission
        Attn: Jennifer Hirsch
        Suite 500 North
        401 9th Street NW
        Washington, D.C. 20004

Name: Sherry Gillespie

Address: 925 H St NW

Phone Number: ___________________________  Email: s.gillespie93@gmail.com

I strongly believe this project needs to result in a completely public space. Any additions and modifications need to be inviting for the community. They need to foster learning and communicating. The addition of cafes and patio space as well as a children's area would be most welcome. I do not believe that this is compatible with residences or offices which would cut the public access.
APPENDIX H:
CORRESPONDENCES RECEIVED
I've started to receive comments on MLK from our website and so I can forward them as I receive them. I think NCPC's public engagement office posted something on Twitter about the public comment period and that is what led to these first few emails. Who on the project team and from the library should I send these to? I don't want to inundate people with the comments/messages, but want to make sure anyone who needs to see the comments receives them.

Thanks,
Jennifer

Jose de Arteaga
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 8:57 PM
To: Hirsch, Jennifer
Subject: MLK Library Comment

Y'all at NCPC should watch the PBS special Broadway in the Hood and see how the Las Vegas Library incorporated this awesome public venue for the performing arts in their new library- really cool! poetry, plays, lectures, debates, films etc
October 22, 2014

Email: jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

National Capital Planning Commission
Attn: Jennifer Hirsch
Suite 500 North
401 9th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004

Re: Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library Renovation and Expansion
(Project: #7610)

Dear Ms. Hirsch:

I am writing on behalf of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City regarding the proposed renovation and expansion of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library (MLK Library). Founded in 1923, the Committee's mission is to safeguard and advance the fundamental planning, environmental and aesthetic values that give Washington its historic distinction, natural beauty and overall livability. The Committee of 100 has long supported renovation of MLK Library and welcomes this opportunity to begin the process.

The following are the Committee of 100’s comments as the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) reviews proposals by the District of Columbia Public Library (DCPL) to renovate and rehabilitate MLK Library. The comments respond to NCPC consideration of the project’s compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The Committee of 100 request that these comments be considered within the scope of issues to be addressed in the Environmental Assessment and through Section 106 consultation.

The Committee of 100 notes that a critical element for evaluating the design concepts is currently missing. MLK Library staff have undertaken an impressive public outreach to help identify the anticipated amounts and types of space needed within a new central library. However, this information has not yet been shared.
Providing a written architectural program which includes square footage calculations will allow the public to consider the need for proposals such as a fifth floor addition. We respectfully urge that this information be provided quickly so that it can be considered within the scope of the NEPA/Section 106 process.

Alternatives A-D

On behalf of the DCPL, the architects at Martinez+Johnson Architecture PC/Mecanoo have proposed four alternative concept designs labeled A-D. They range from simple renovation to adding four stories to the existing building and modifying other areas subject to its landmark status. NCPC has no preferred alternative and confirmed that elements from each alternative may be combined to later create a fifth concept design. Elements not currently proposed within the four concept designs may also be added to a fifth concept design. While the Committee of 100 generally supports Alternative A (no action beyond renovation), the other alternatives have some elements that would be beneficial to consider and pursue. The following comments respond to the major elements found within the four concept designs and support the creation of a fifth alternative.

Alternative E: Fifth Floor Addition

The fact that an extension of the existing outer curtain wall was not included as an alternative concept design proposal is a glaring omission. Mies anticipated such an addition and it should now be the basis for immediately including a fifth option, Alternative E, for the following reasons.

The 2007 landmark registration form for MLK Library cites the potential addition of one or two floors (Section 8 Page 9):

"As specified in Peterson’s Statement of Program, the building was expandable. As built, the library could house up to two million volumes of books but was designed to accommodate additional floors. In a library conference session, Milton, S. Byam, Director of D.C. Public Library and successor to Harry Peterson, indicates that one additional floor could be added to the building to accommodate an additional million volumes of books.32 Harry Peterson, in press reports at the time of the building's initial design, however, is quoted as saying that the structure "will be so designed that one or two additional floors could eventually increase the library's capacity to 3 million books."33


Extending the design is an obvious solution that has been widely discussed. Jack Bowman, supervising architect for the Mies building when it was constructed, recently confirmed to the DCPL staff and architects that Mies designed the building with the extension option. The Freelon Group included an extension (below) as one option for consideration as part of a Sept. 2012 study prepared by the Urban Land Institute. The Committee of 100 passed a resolution in 2012 (attached) recommending an extension
if extra floors were deemed necessary. The Committee of 100 resolution was shared with DCPL staff and it’s Advisory Panel in June 2014 so the proposal was ripe for consideration as the four Section 106 alternatives were being prepared.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation provides guidance for insuring that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The Standards have institutionalized the precept that new work be distinguishably different from the original structure. However, it should not be applied in so literal and inflexible a manner so as to remove rational options. In this instance, the option would be to extend the exterior already designed and sanctioned by the architect, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. Such an option would be consistent with achieving the Standards’ ultimate goal of a compatible addition that protects the historic integrity of the property. What would be more compatible?

There is already a nearby precedent for taking such an approach: Dulles Airport. The main terminal was designed in 1958 by Eero Saarinen. The architect included a plan for expanding the building that was not fully realized until 1996. The result was a seamless extension which preserved one architectural vision. The same can be accomplished with the Mies structure.

If the Mies addition is not the obvious choice, how can we consider placing another architectural vision on top of the city’s only Mies-designed building? Can we identify any other Mies van der Rohe buildings with roof top extensions designed by other architects? Beyond the floor addition, why would it be acceptable to plant trees on top of a Mies building? Why would it be acceptable to allow people to wander around the roof so that they become part of the urban view plane seen from 9th and G Streets? Phrased differently, height restrictions have been placed on some distinguishably different projects whereby the new construction combined with the historic fabric cannot be seen from across the street at six feet high. Applying this principle, why would it then be acceptable to see trees and people on top of MLK Library? Why is there no concern that a non-Miesian addition could threaten MLK Library’s landmark designation?

Until recently, the Mies building has lived an uncomfortable life in Washington. Its minimalist architecture definitely fulfilled the precept of being “distinguishably different.” Other than the fact that its low level profile complimented the Patent Building across the street, MLK Library was largely incompatible with most of the downtown urban fabric at the time of its construction in 1972. It specifically clashed with the 1961 First Congregational United Church of Christ (FCUCC) building with which it shared the block, both in terms of style, materials and height.

That is no longer the case. The city is now home to a myriad of new, glass minimalist towers. Two neighboring structures have been specifically designed to pay homage to the Mies building:
the ten story FCUCC/Jamestown building constructed in 2012 and the nine story 900 G Street building nearing completion. They are 21st century minimalist gems placed as tributes to our 20th century minimalist landmark. Quite simply, the 900 block of G Street, NW has the chance of becoming an International Style architectural showcase once the library is renovated. Why would we compromise that vision?

By definition, minimalist architecture is reduced to its essential elements. For a Mies structure, it is a sophisticated design that achieves geometric balance and harmony with the least amount of materials. It is a singular vision. There is no balance and harmony when the viewer is confronted with a second architect’s distinguishably different vision.

Given the compelling evidence provided for a simple extension of the Mies design, the Committee of 100 respectfully requests that it be included as a fifth concept design (Alternative E) within the scope of the Environmental Assessment and Section 106 consultations.

Fifth Floor Design

Alternative B offers a stepped-back Miesian rectangular design as an option for the fifth floor. While the design is compatible, it includes outdoor patios allowing people to walk around the roof. As noted, the Committee of 100 opposes an outdoor terrace.

An extended Mies fifth floor would provide ample opportunity for a dynamic public space. It could include a glass ceiling allowing visitors to view the city from a spectacular enclosed, light-filled event space that would be available throughout the year. Similar to Alternative B, the building’s penthouse infrastructure would be enclosed within the fifth floor thereby creating a flat rooftop when viewed from the street.

The Committee of 100 opposes the curvilinear event space (Alternative C) and three-story addition (Alternative D) as “distinguishably different” designs that are incompatible with the Mies structure. The curvilinear roof design is a clumsy, amorphic shape. In contrast, an oval shape could be compatible since it would be symmetrical and the opposite of a rectangle. The three story angled bar is an unwelcome parody of the FCUCC/Jamestown building. It would block the view of the adjoining building and undermine its architectural inventiveness.

Attention must also be given to MLK Library’s height and color. Anything beyond five floors threatens to eliminate the juxtaposition and balance that currently exists with the neighboring buildings. The visual weight of MLK Library’s black color must also be taken into consideration, especially since the building will be repainted and likely appear a bit darker. The structure’s visual heaviness is now in accord with its surrounding buildings. This will not be the case if multiple floors are added.

Is a Fifth Floor Needed?

For the past decade, library officials have testified that MLK Library is too large. Therefore, it is a bit surprising that following recent public outreach, it has been determined that the building is actually too
small and needs an additional floor. While the Committee of 100 supports the efforts to reconstruct a facility that addresses the current and future needs of the community, we recommend that further analysis be undertaken to confirm the anticipated space demands. For context, MLK Library is 400,000 sq. ft., Seattle is 363,000 sq. ft. and Salt Lake City is 240,000 sq. ft. Since MLK Library was chronically underfunded for decades and allowed to deteriorate, we must seek guarantees that a newly enlarged building would not suffer the same fate.

Public Cores & Loading Dock

A redesign of the four public cores could be accomplished in a manner that is harmonious with the Mies architecture, including within the landmarked restoration zone. This could include installation of new glass-enclosed staircases that make building navigation more apparent and welcoming to the visitor. Nevertheless, the brick walls within the first floor reading rooms and central hall should remain intact since they are important contributing elements for visually defining those rooms within a minimalist vocabulary. Also, the new stairwell elements must be symmetrical and balanced, using Miesian proportions. For example, the staircase in Option B-2 is off-center and the glass/brick wall in front of the staircase is asymmetrical.

Elimination of the street level loading dock provides an opportunity to expand the central hall and visually connect the building with G Place. It should be possible to retain the central hall’s main east-west axis while adding a new north-south axis.

Ground Floor Exterior

Brick Walls: The exterior brick walls under the logia were originally intended to be clad in green marble and be flush with the rest of the building’s glass facade. This could be accomplished in a redesign and would be consistent with Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation since it was part of the original Mies design and the choice of bricks was based on cost, not aesthetics. In fact, since the new FCUCC/Jamestown and 900 G St. towers have green-tinted glass, the green marble might be a dynamic complement that would also enhance the MLK Library entrance. Other materials might be acceptable such as the proposed etched glass. While the current brick walls are not as attractive as marble, they do serve as visual clues for locating the building entrance. Any replacement construction must achieve the same effect.

Light Wells: Alternatives C and D include a proposal for glass light wells in front of the current exterior brick walls. This is an innovative idea that raises a number of practical questions. How would you stop people from walking across it or playing on the glass? How would you keep it clean? If a fence is needed, this would not be very attractive and may not be harmonious with the Mies design. The glass light well would also reduce the amount of public space under the logia and become a barrier to pedestrian access.

MLK Library’s West Side: Public use of the open area on the building’s west side along with the adjoining pocket park shared with FCUCC/Jamestown needs to be fully explored. The current bike kiosk operation is an innovative experiment but other uses should also be considered. Turning the
pocket park into a sculpture garden honoring Martin Luther King, Jr. is just one example. Since the pocket park is shared with FCUCC/Jamestown, any use must be mutually agreed upon and simultaneously complement (and not obstruct) the Church’s green light box and gray brick wall.

**MLK Library’s North Side:** The G Place side of MLK Library has always been an underserved building element. It includes a loading dock and awkward brick walls and metal fencing installed to address security concerns and the inclined ground. Efforts to enliven the space with designs and materials consistent with the Mies vocabulary are welcomed.

**Interior**

The architects should be given freedom to design the building’s interior so as to create well-planned, rationale, exciting and engaging spaces. Any new designs must be compatible with the Mies vocabulary. Such elements might include square or rectangular designs and grids; use of glass, steel, brick and stone; and smooth and undecorated walls. If seeking to be distinguishably different within areas of the building not subject to a landmark designation, the design can pursue elements that provide a rationale and compelling compliment to the Mies vocabulary – circles, 45 or 60 degree angles, secondary colors, etc.

**Summary**

The Committee of 100 prefers retaining the current four-story structure. The Committee of 100 respectfully requests that a fifth concept design (Alternative E) consisting of a one-story extension of the Mies designed building be included within the scope of the current Environmental Assessment and Section 106 consultations in case a fifth floor is deemed necessary based on further analysis. The Committee of 100 supports a combination of compatible elements from the other four Alternatives described above within a newly renovated building although this should not include rooftop trees or outside access.

Thank you for this opportunity to share these comments. Feel free to contact me or C100 member Stuart Gosswein (202/777-1220, sgosswein@aol.com) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Nancy MacWood
Chair
RESOLVED, that the Committee of 100 on the Federal City advocates continued use of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library building as a library. Any renovation of the building should be consistent with the Design Guidelines published in conjunction with the landmark designation. If joint tenancy with the library is proposed for the building, necessitating the addition of floors to the building, those floors should be limited to one or two in number, as originally envisioned by the building's architect Mies van der Rohe, and should match the architect's original design of the building.
Jennifer Hirsch  
Federal Preservation Officer | Urban Design and Plan Review  
National Capital Planning Commission  
401 9th Street, N.W. | Suite 500  
Washington, D.C., 20004 | 202-482-7239  
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

-----Original Message-----
From: District Library Dynamos [mailto:dclibrarydynamo@rushpost.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 4:57 PM
To: Hirsch, Jennifer
Cc: dc4reality@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comments; Environmental Assessment, Project: #7610

Dear Ms. Hirsch,

See attached.
I also faxed these comments.

Please confirm receipt.

Thank you,

Chris Otten
To: Jennifer Hirsch, The National Capital Planning Commission, 401 9th Street NW, Suite 500 North, Washington, DC 20004, jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

From: Chris Otten, District Library Dynamos, 1530 P Street NW, Washington, DC 20009, dcliibrarydynamo@rushpost.com

Re: Public Comments Submission, Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library Renovation and Expansion, Environmental Assessment, Project: #7610

October 31, 2014

To Ms. Hirsch:

A public meeting was held on October 7, 2014, at the King Memorial Library whereby National Capital Planning officials (NCPC), along with DC Public Library officials (DCPL) explained that the MLK Library renovation must include a process called the NEPA Public Scoping and 106 Review.

Documents handed to the public at this October 7, 2014 public meeting included an MLK Scoping Meeting Presentation file, as seen online here >> http://www.ncpc.gov/DocumentDepot/MLK_Scoping_Meeting_Presentation_final.pdf

**Purpose of the NEPA/106 Review**

NCPC officials referenced the aforementioned MLK Scoping presentation document when explaining the purpose of the NEPA scoping review as it pertains to the renovation of our central public library.

On page 10 of this document, NCPC highlights the environmental issues and impact topics that will be taken into consideration for the NEPA 106 review, as follows:

**POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES & IMPACT TOPICS**

- Traffic and Transportation
- Scenic Resources/ Viewsheds
- Historic Structures and Districts
- Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials
- Land Use (public space, building use, planning policies, socioeconomics)
- Storm water
- Utilities
- Energy

On page 11, NCPC delves a bit more into the NEPA/106 process as having, "[t]he purpose of consultation to identify historic properties, assess adverse effects, and resolve those adverse
Researching this NEPA/106 process, we also came across a helpful manual called, "Preserving America’s Heritage, ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION, Protecting Historic Properties: A CITIZEN’S GUIDE TO SECTION 106 REVIEW" (http://www.achp.gov/docs/CitizenGuide.pdf).

On page 5 of this Citizen's Guide, particularly under the heading, "SECTION 106: WHAT IS AN ADVERSE EFFECT?,” one gets a further sense of what the NEPA/106 is evaluating:

Adverse effects can be direct or indirect and include the following:

- physical destruction or damage;
- alteration inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties relocation of the property;
- change in the character of the property’s use or setting;
- introduction of incompatible visual, atmospheric, or audible elements;
- neglect and deterioration;
- transfer, lease, or sale of a historic property out of federal control without adequate preservation restrictions

Given the purpose of NEPA/106 process and topics under review, and given the limited information provide by DCPL to NCPC at this juncture about the possible future uses on top of the library, the District Library Dynamos concludes that the NEPA/106 review for the MLK Library renovation project is way too premature.

Premature NEPA/106 Review

At this stage, when evaluating all of the documents and written intentions currently on the public record, it can be argued that the NEPA/106 review is premature and will result in ill-informed and unsubstantiated reporting thus wasting public time and money. Why?

There are at least three outstanding key questions which demonstrate that the NEPA/106 process is premature at this point:

- What will go on the roof of our MLK Library, if anything?
- Who will the air rights and rooftop structures of our historic building be owned by?
- What type of land use and socio-economic impacts will these above decisions have on this historic library structure and surrounding federal interests?

Right now, NCPC has said they will consider four design alternatives, labeled A, B, C, or D, as found on page 15 of the aforementioned scoping presentation documents (http://www.ncpc.gov/DocumentDepot/MLK_Scoping_Meeting_Presentation_final.pdf).

Looking at alternatives B, C, or D, will the rooftop configurations and structures be public space with public purposes inter-related with the library or other public agency? Sadly, it seems there
is still a chance that the rooftop and air-rights will not be public.

Marcel Acosta, Executive Director of NCPC writes in his cover letter to David Maloney of the Historic Preservation Office, dated September 17, 2014,

“... the project may include the construction of additional space for non-library uses through the use of a public-private partnership.” ED Acosta goes on to write, “...the project... may entail leveraging the resources of a public/private partnership yet to be identified.”

The privatization question is a huge issue and the is the elephant in the Great Hall. This is the case even despite the fact that DC residents and library users have overwhelmingly rejected privatization at all of the DCPL-hosted public forums about the renovation of the King Memorial Library (no other central library in the world would have this type of public-private scheme).

If the roof structures found in B, C, or D are to be privatized and developed for private residential or office space, that means hundreds of people will reside and/or be working on a daily basis above the library. On its face, the impacts of this type of land-use is far greater than what would come from a publicly-controlled use-space.

NEPA/106 review of possible privatized residential and office space requires much more examination of impacts from much more significant and intensive energy, water, and other space needs and infrastructure that will have to be included in our historic library structure and space. For example, where will all the sewer pipes and electrical conduit run throughout our historic library to serve the private residences or offices above?

Maintenance issues going forward would also need serious, and long-term consideration, particularly if the private maintenance schedules don't meet the needs of the public library below.

Analysis of future impacts and affects of privatizing the roof of our library, which takes accountability of maintenance and ownership out of public hands is quite disconcerting, especially if poorly maintained private energy and water systems damage the library and its materials below.

Further, there is no sense of who would own the rights to the space above the library if its privatized making the future of this historic structure much less certain. Analysis of real impacts of intertwining public and private interests would have to be conducted, but would be problematic as there is far less transparency of the privatized space and its uses.

All of these issues I mention above, pivoting on this question of a privatized or public space on top of our of existing historic central public library, relate directly to the topics and impacts that the NEPA/106 is supposed to review.

But since the issue of who will own, what will be there, and how the space on the roof of our
library may be used has still not been dispensed with, as requested by the public, then the NEPA/106 review is way too premature and will result in a report not based on substantial evidence or fully evaluated findings.

Conclusion

The District Dynamos would like to ask NCPC to request DCPL work with the public and City officials to make a final decision about the ownership and use scheme anticipated for whatever structure may or may not go on the roof of DC's central library before proceeding with any NEPA/106 review.

We look forward to your response.

Regards,

Chris Otten, Coordinator
DC Library Dynamos
1530 P Street, NW
202-387-8030
dclibrarydynamo@rushpost.com
Comments on MLK from our neighbor...

Jeff Bonvechio
202.442.6070

Hey Jeff –

Sid’s a good guy and the comments expressed are not unreasonable. I believe that the garage entry proposition is already off the table. Regardless, do I tell him to weigh in through any official public scoping channel? Is the First Congregational UCC a consulting party?

Thanks.

October is National Disability Employment Awareness Month. To learn what you can do to foster a more inclusive workforce, visit www.dol.gov/odep and www.dds.dc.gov.

Mr. Richard Reyes-Gavilan, Chief Librarian/Executive Director
MLK Library
9th and G. St., NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Rich,

We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you last month and get to know you, Meaghan, and Jean a bit better. We value you, our neighbor and partner, in strengthening the quality of life for all who visit us on G Street between 10th and 9th. We are also excited about the renovation of the Library and want to help during your time of transition in any way that we can.
As promised, we are following up our conversation with a summary of our concerns about the June 13, 2014 draft MLK Concept Design so that you can share it with both Mecanoo and Martinez + Johnson Architecture as well as Jeff Bonvecchio, Project Manager:

**MLK Garage entry** – On p. 17, Option 2 suggests accessing the MLK garage through the Church parking garage. This plan is not feasible since our organ chamber extends down into the garage beginning at the end of the ramp and cannot be relocated. Any further construction activity in this area would harm this delicate instrument.

**Bike Kiosk** – On p. 29, a bicycle kiosk shed is proposed in the pocket park abutting our building. While we are committed to a public purpose in this space, we feel that it is very important that it continue to be an open space without an additional permanent structure such as the proposed kiosk.

We would like to work with the Library on a treatment for this outdoor space that would create a clear view from 9th St. through the MLK Plaza and ending at the handsome gray wall and light box of the church. To do this would require cutting the yellow wall back to the fence that closes off the alley and perhaps placing a significant piece of sculpture related to Dr. King and his legacy facing east with the gray brick wall of the Church as the backdrop. This could tie the open space under the Library with the pocket park as one visually seamless space. Perhaps we could collaborate on a grant application for a permanent piece of artwork to tie these two spaces together as one grand public plaza.

**Opening the Alley** – On p. 28, there is proposal to open the alley connecting G St. to G Place. At the outset of our Church redevelopment, we went to considerable time and expense to close the alley that had become a haven for drug activity, loitering, sleeping and trash. The city concurred and the back end of the alley beyond the fence is now owned half by the Library, and half by Jamestown Properties and the Church. It has provided an excellent off-street loading area for our building and has cleared up a lot of haphazard onsite parking from both the Library and the Church that had previously been a problem for both institutions. We would oppose reopening the alley.

**Addition to top of MLK** - As we indicated in the meeting, we sought to be very sensitive to the context of our new building relative to our neighbors, particularly MLK Library. Thus, we cut away the top of the building so that MLK was more visible and adopted a minimalist design. It is our hope that any addition to the building will follow the expansion design Mies van der Rohe foresaw and continue the current floor pattern upward rather than departing significantly from his intention as the current proposed diagonal addition does.
As the design process proceeds, we hope you contact us to discuss any ideas relating to our mutual interests in advance of making those design ideas public. You can call Sid at the Church – 628-4317 or Meg at 202-546-4536 since she is serving as a public representative on the Advisory Panel.

Again, we are so pleased that the Library is our neighbor and look forward to joint undertakings in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney D. Fowler, Senior Minister
Susie Hayward, Moderator
Meg Maguire, Site Development Chairperson

Rev. Dr. Sidney D. Fowler
First Congregational United Church of Christ
945 G Street NW
Washington, DC
(church) 202.628.4317, (mobile) 202.870.0316
(hm) 202.332.1185

Please like First UCC, DC, on Facebook!

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
Hi Ms. Hirsch,

I wanted to write to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed Mecanoo-designed four-story addition to the MLK library. The addition and interior renovation will compliment the existing architecture and help bring the library into the 21st century.

Thank you,

David Garber

David Garber // Twitter // Facebook // Instagram // 202-374-5340
Fyi..Public comment received via NCPC website.

Jennifer Hirsch
Federal Preservation Officer | Urban Design and Plan Review
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, N.W. | Suite 500
Washington, D.C., 20004 | 202-482-7239
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Kou [mailto:Koupeter262@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 7:28 AM
To: Hirsch, Jennifer
Subject: MLK Library Comment

The Dulles Airport Terminal Building extension repeated the structural system of the original without deviating from the form of the Masterpiece.
The MLK Library Building is the work of another Master Architect Mies’ original concept envisioned a taller building. So it is a "no brainier" to extend the building by adding more stories by repeating the envelope system.
Comments regarding the Environmental Assessment process, Item #7610
Martin Luther King Jr. Central Library
Washington, DC

Submitted by
Richard Layman
216 Quackenbos Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

Given recent changes in the DC Public Library System’s plan for renovation and expansion of the Central Library, one significant matter remains that requires significant consideration within the Environmental Assessment/Section 106 process.

That is the potential for the addition of unrelated mixed use commercial and/or residential space within the building site. In promotional materials, this concept has been rendered as an ‘add-on” structure on top of an expanded Mies building envelope, as a building distinguished by its separateness, in keeping with the general recommendations of the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines concerning “modern” additions to historic buildings.

Generating revenues by leasing space. For many reasons, this is not a good idea, although it has been justified for financial reasons, although the city has already committed $200 million to the estimated total project cost of $250 million, and it is not unreasonable to consider that remaining balance of $50 million could be raised through private fundraising and sponsorship. For example, the recent $185 million San Diego Central Library project raised $60 million in private donations for construction and $15 million for an operating endowment¹.

Mixing national and local cultural assets in the “Federal City.” DC is different from many other cities, even other global cities like New York City, in that it possesses a wide range of federal cultural assets, such as the Smithsonian Museums, the National Gallery of Art, the Kennedy Center, and the Library of Congress, which often supplant the presence of locally-controlled cultural assets in the public’s mind.

The development of a set of local cultural assets within Washington, DC such as a pre-eminent fine arts museum, Central Library, history museum, and performing arts facilities has been stunted in the face of the existence of federal cultural institutions, especially when compared to other major US cities (such as New York City, Los Angeles, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia), and other world capitals.

The continued maturation of the local element of what is otherwise a “federal city”—last week being the 40th anniversary of the Home Rule Act—could be expressed and local identity strengthened through the development, delivery, and operation of a set of exemplary cultural assets, through the creation of an integrated public realm framework.

The Central Library is typically the most prominent local cultural asset in a community, along with a public auditorium.

Mixing unrelated commercial or residential uses in pre-eminent public buildings. An inventory of central libraries in major US cities as well as an examination of the European case studies in the recently published *Contemporary Library Architecture: A Planning and Design Guide* finds that no major city in the United States or in Europe mixes unrelated commercial or residential uses within pre-eminent municipally-controlled and operated civic assets such as the city hall, publicly-owned museums, or the central library.

However, central libraries have been developed in Vancouver, San Diego, Salt Lake City, and Rockville, Maryland which have other public educational or government uses present within the building footprint, but do not include unrelated “mixed use” (commercial or residential) space.

---

3 Nonprofit museums not controlled by local municipalities in New York City (MOMA), Denver (Denver Art Museum and the Museum of Contemporary Art have separate small upscale projects), Dallas (the Museum Tower building is in the Arts District, but not part of a museum) and Washington, DC (Newseum Residences apartments) have developed residential condominiums or apartments as part of museum expansion or redevelopment projects. Public museums such as the Metropolitan Museum of New York City, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, or the Brooklyn Museum of Art have not pursued similar projects.
4 The Vancouver library in British Columbia rents office space to a provincial government agency and has a small conference facility used by community organizations.
5 The San Diego Central Library has rented two floors to the local school district for a public charter high school serving Downtown.
6 The Salt Lake Library complex includes a library store, art gallery, two cafes, space rented to the local National Public Radio affiliate, and the Community Writing Center operated by the local community college system.
7 The Rockville library building has office space separately rented to the Montgomery County Government and a cultural facility called the Center for Visual Arts.
Note that mixed use facilities incorporating housing and/or retail uses, supporting neighborhood-community improvement initiatives and public goals, are not out of the ordinary or incongruent when delivered and operated at the sub-city or neighborhood scale⁸.

Furthermore, I have argued that the question of appropriateness is not mixing “for profit” and “non profit” uses as much as it is mixing unrelated and related uses.

Mixing related cultural-educational-media/informational uses within a central library building could be considered congruent by extending the capacity of the “building” to satisfy various public uses while mixing a library and housing or unrelated office space is incongruent with the mission of a city’s pre-eminent cultural facility.

For example, media uses (a community newspaper—local radio station—what about WPFW or WeAct Radio, public access cable television), publishing (book and magazine publishing), book and media sales such as bookstores or news-stands—the Quebec National Bibliothèque and Archives in Montreal has bookselling stalls on the backside of the library operated by independent booksellers—could logically be included within a “City of the Book⁹” or expanded community cultural complex, regardless of whether or not the uses are delivered by for profit businesses or nonprofit organizations.

---


⁹ The City of the Book cultural complex in Aix-en-Provence, France includes the city library, a training facility for librarians, the archives of Albert Camus, and dance, cinema, and music facilities, and an annual book festival.
The “Library Park” initiative in Medillin, Colombia as an element of neighborhood and residential social inclusion is a particularly interesting example of libraries as the augurs of community improvement projects incorporating cultural, park, and public space and service functions with libraries as the primary anchor. Other cities have developed cultural complexes, with the central library at the center, Salt Lake City being one example.

The 1990s renovation of the Wilson Building by T. Conrad Monts as an example of mixing local and non-local uses in a prominent public building. We should also remember in the 1990s when the city proposed to pay for the renovation of the Wilson Building, DC’s City Hall, by renting two-thirds of the building to the Federal Government. At the time the city was broke and contracted with a developer, out of desperation, to renovate the building “for free.” In this case, free was going to be paid for by the federal government lease and loss of use of the space for 20 years.

Residents and advocates erupted, responding negatively, and after public opprobrium, the city backed down from this poorly considered agreement, and broke the contract, although at great expense to the public, because the developer had to be repaid.

It is not a good precedent for the consideration of similar mixing of unrelated uses within the Central Library, especially by the development of space—residential—whose use cannot be changed without significant expense and difficulty.

The role of public buildings, the public realm, civic identity, and civic life as an element of the Section 106/Environmental Assessment process. Normally, the Section 106/Environmental Assessment process is straightforward, and deals with potential positive and negative impacts of (federal) undertakings on historic buildings, sites, and structures—questions like demolition, impact on and maintenance of architectural character and integrity, special merit concerning changes, whether or not the changes are so significant that a landmark designation is rescinded (such as with Soldier Field in Chicago) etc.

This case is different because specific plans proffered with regard to the Martin Luther King Junior Central Library raise concerns about the role of pre-eminent public buildings within local civic and cultural life. The impact of these proposed changes are an appropriate question for consideration within the Environmental review process, even though they aren’t necessarily architectural questions.

1. The first question is whether or not adding unrelated non-civic or non-cultural space to the Central Library diminishes the historic character and qualities of the building. (That is a separate question from adding more building to the building in a manner distinctly different from the Mies footprint, which these comments do not address, although to my way of thinking it makes sense to just make the Mies building bigger, along the lines of the arguments expressed by Stephen Semes in Future of the Past: A Conservation Ethic for Architecture, Urbanism and Historic Preservation11.)

---

2. The second question is to consider whether or not the function of the library in terms of its place in the public commons and the public sphere would be diminished by the addition of unrelated commercial or residential space in any way to the building’s footprint.

Arguably, along with City Hall and local court buildings, the Martin Luther King Junior Central Library is one of local Washington’s most prominent civic assets and the most prominent local cultural facility.

**Conclusion.** It is reasonable to assert that the role of the central library within our community is so important and fundamental to the development and expression of local identity and civic life, that mixing unrelated non-cultural uses within the building program is a significant diminishment of the Central Library as the city’s foremost local cultural asset.

**Recommendation.**

The disallowance of mixing unrelated commercial and/or residential uses as part of the renovation and expansion of the Martin Luther King Jr. Central Library should be one of the findings and recommendations of the Environmental assessment review process.

Note that expansion of the building for related cultural, educational, media, and informational uses is not considered to be incongruent in the context of a Section 106 review.

---

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/20/arts/design/fighting-crime-with-architecture-in-medellin-colombia.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
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Jennifer Hirsch
Federal Preservation Officer | Urban Design and Plan Review
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, N.W. | Suite 500
Washington, D.C., 20004 | 202-482-7239
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Meg Maguire [mailto:megmaguireconsultant@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 2:47 PM
To: Hirsch, Jennifer
Subject: MLK Library NEPA and Sec. 106 Comments

Jennifer,
Attached are my comments on the MLK Library. Please let me know by return email that you have received them and if you wish me to send a hard copy by snail mail.

Thanks.
Meg

Meg Maguire
Community Conservation Consultant
631 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002
202-546-4536
October 28, 2014

To: Ms. Jennifer Hirsch  
National Capital Planning Commission  
401 9th St., NW - North Lobby, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20004

From: Meg Maguire, Member of the Advisory Panel for the MLK Library

I am pleased to submit comments on the four alternatives for the renovation/addition and related issues of the MLK Library as part of the simultaneous NEPA and Section 106 reviews.

I. Architectural Program

It is difficult for the public to understand the four alternatives without seeing a formal written architectural program that spells out the functions of the building and explains why a fifth floor is needed. The Library staff is now preparing an interim architectural program and I urge that this document be posted on the NCPC web site as soon as possible.

For many years we heard that the MLK building was too large and that perhaps excess space would be given over to a public/private partnership. However, after extensive public meetings, it is clear that DC residents want their main library to be a community gathering center where they can learn, share, create and find assistance within a light and spacious environment. To achieve this vision, the Library staff and the architects have determined that a fifth floor is necessary. The logic behind this more expansive design needs to be understood broadly by members of the public and by public officials alike as people come together to press for adequate funding and an accelerated schedule for delivery of this project. The posted document will also allow the public to review and comment on the Library staff’s conclusions regarding the need for an enlarged facility, since this will require a commitment to support and maintain the extra space.

II. The Alternatives

One problem with judging the alternatives is that they are not all equal in size or function. While Alternatives B and C are roughly equivalent in size and function, Alternative D would serve an entirely different purpose – private development -- and should be judged against other alternatives that would serve the same purpose. Therefore, if there is to be a substantial profit-making addition considered, the NEPA and Section 106 process should be reinstituted specifically to look at design alternatives to accommodate such development that have yet to be conceived.
Alternative A: *Do nothing* - Everyone agrees that we must do something bold and visionary. Doing nothing is not a viable option.

Alternative B: *Rectilinear addition* – This concept is the best of the four presented because it maintains the simplicity of the original building and is the least intrusive visually from the street below. (However, there should be an Alternative E: Extend the Mies Design as proposed below that adds one floor as Mies suggested would be possible. See further description of this proposed alternative below.)

Alternative C: *Curvilinear addition* – There is no rationale for this amoeba-shaped hat atop a classical Mies building. His architecture is characterized by simple enclosures that house human activity in light-filled spaces. Alternative C introduces something quite foreign to Miesian design – a misfit that should be discarded from further consideration.

On the interior, my personal preference is to open up as much of the building to light as possible without compromising those elements of the landmarked Main Hall that are essential to maintain integrity of the first floor space. Those walls that are deemed not to have been part of the original design could then be dealt with to achieve this objective. The architectural team has presented some interesting ideas to open the building to light and transparency and I look forward to their development during the design process.

Alternative D: *5th Floor Curvilinear Event Space + 3 Story Addition* - This is not so much a space as an alien spaceship, out-of-scale and out-of-context, diminishing all around it – the Library, St. Patrick’s, the Mather Building, the new building opposite the Library, and the next door neighbor, First Congregational UCC (the Church), that took special care to honor its landmark neighbor by cutting away to reveal more of that building. The public would be bombarded by this overbearing structure from afar, up close and in the reflection in the new glass building across the street. Alternative D is highly controversial both because it assumes a massive private addition and because it is so out of place and disrespectful of Mies’ simplicity. **In the interest of moving forward on the important business of reaching consensus, this alternative needs to be removed from any further consideration.**

Alternative E: *Miesian Addition of One Floor* – Another alternative should be added to the four now under consideration – a Miesian Addition. While Mies may not have left drawings for an addition, he did indicate that the building could be added to in the future and that the structure could support such an addition. The design is self-evident. The fifth floor would simply be a repetition of the fourth floor, which is a repetition of the third and second. Since some members of the design team of the original building are still alive, it might be possible to interview them and record their discussions during design about the addition. This oral history and recollection could help to provide further documentation of Mies’ intention.

As part of its work for the Urban Land Institute, the Freelon Group developed an option that shows this simple and handsome solution:
The Miesian addition would be contextually compatible with other structures on the street. Because the entire building will get new glass and be repainted, this simple extension of what is there now would blend in seamlessly. Because it would be the top floor and not be required to bear the weight of another floor above it, a glass ceiling would be possible, letting a great deal of light into the entire building and making possible a lush indoor garden to illuminate the entire top floor year-round, as opposed to the exterior spaces shown in Alternatives A-D whose use would be very limited in rain, snow, hot and cold weather. The middle portion of the fourth floor (and possibly the third floor) could be opened as well to create a light-filled atrium.

_The public needs to know that there is another option to find space for the future needs of the Library and have an opportunity to comment on this possibility._

### III. The Exterior Yellow Brick Wall

Removal of much of the yellow brick wall surrounding the Library could work wonders both for the neighboring properties and for bringing light into the Library. For example, removal of a small portion of the wall on the western side could open the Church’s pocket park back to the north/south brick wall/planter to become the termination of the sight line extending from 9th to the gray brick on the side of the Church. This space would be ideal for a stunning sculpture of, or related to, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. In an email to Richard Reyes-Gavilan in mid-October, 2014, the Church expressed interest in collaborating with the Library to find funding from private foundations or other charitable sources for such a sculpture.

The Church has also expressed its opposition to filling the pocket park with a bike kiosk that would adjoin or block the view of the Church, stating instead that there are better uses for this space as part of a visionary public space that joins the pocket park with the Library loggia. But this would be possible only if at least a section of the yellow wall were removed. In addition, the Church went to considerable effort and expense to close the alley and has been pleased that it is now used for loading rather than for extensive loitering, trash and drugs. Removal of the yellow brick wall dividing the loading area from MLK would require that another barrier be constructed such as an attractive iron fence, but this could be done to offer greater transparency without sacrificing security. Any discussion of alterations to the alley should include both the Church and Jamestown, owner of the office building. Any changes must meet the needs of all parties.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this exciting project.
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________________________________________________
Jennifer Hirsch
Federal Preservation Officer | Urban Design and Plan Review
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, N.W. | Suite 500
Washington, D.C., 20004 | 202-482-7239
jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: robin diener [mailto:robinsdiener@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 5:07 PM
To: Hirsch, Jennifer
Subject: Consulting Party MLK Library Project # 7610

Please find our comments attached. Thank you!

Robin Diener
202 431-9254
Jennifer Hirsch  
National Capital Planning Commission  
401 9th Street, NW Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20004  
October 31, 2014

Dear Ms. Hirsch:

MLK Library Friends are volunteers who support the mission of the public library and the activities of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library through advocacy, programming and fundraising. We have closely observed and participated in the public consultation process for the redesign and renovation of the MLK Library. We look forward to further involvement and welcome this opportunity to give preliminary comments to the National Capital Planning Commission regarding Historic Preservation and Environmental Impact on MLK Library.

Across the city we have found general issues of interest and concern are: honoring the legacy of Dr. King; ensuring the library building and air space remain public; bringing light and vibrancy to the building; and ensuring the highest standards possible for environmental sustainability. We touch on them below in as requested in your letter to consulting parties. First however, we would like to provide background to the process that has finally brought us to this point.

Central public libraries are arguably the most important civic projects cities can undertake. Open to all, their charge is to provide access to information, as well as space for civic, educational and cultural activities. As might be predicted, such an important project has been buffeted by changing political headwinds in the District beginning as far back as fifteen years with recommendations for renovation from a pro-bono study requested by the Board of Library Trustees, to efforts by mayors to sell the library building, to attempts to privatize the airspace by deputy mayors for economic development, to efforts to downsize the library by the Chief Librarian, and now to a creative renovation combined with an expansion of public space currently favored by the Library staff.

The MLK Library Friends supports this latest concept – to creatively renovate the central library and expand public space. To the extent that the process continues to be frustrating, we look forward to NCPC bringing objectivity, consistency, and an understanding of comprehensive, long range planning to what has been a long and arduous process.

Sincerely yours,

Robin Diener, President, MLK Library Friends
MLK Central Public Library and Partnerships

One thing that has become clear to the MLK Library Friends—who have closely observed and participated in all aspects of the public consultation process—is that the public-at-large does not support privatization of its central public library building or airspace.

Furthermore, no major OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) city, and, certainly, no national capital city has taken such an action. Three floors of unrelated mixed use dropped atop what has the potential to be Washington’s most prominent civic and cultural asset, and including unrelated, private mixed use on the building within its footprint is a significant diminishment of a public resource as well as an insult to the library’s namesake.

In view of concerns about underfunding the library in the past, it is reasonable to consider cost sharing with other city agencies such as the DC Archives or Department of Employment Services, or potential revenue streams such as a conference center. Public partnerships could well be appropriate and advisable, but have not been explored. It remains unclear whom the building will serve or how it will meet their needs. Attached is the MLK Friends’ resolution in support of full public funding and asking for an analysis of potential public partnership opportunities.

Need for a Building Program

It is difficult, if not impossible, to logically comment on the alternative schemes for the MLK Library thus far since no formal building program has yet been presented to, or approved by, the Board of Library Trustees. Neither has a formal program been shared with the public or with members of the Advisory Panel, such as the MLK Library Friends.

Some of the designs presented at the October 7, 2014 NCPC meeting had not been previously shown to the public—this includes the three most recent meetings in September which were specifically convened by the Advisory Panel at request of DCPL to gather public input. At the NCPC meeting for the first time, DCPL presented a fifth floor option as necessary to fulfill the central library’s space requirements. For many years, DCPL officials asserted that the central library is too big. The public at large and library advocates have always disagreed with that assessment. The advocates’ view is that budgetary constraints—for a time bordering on demolition by neglect—kept MLK from being utilized to its full potential.

While DCPL’s decision to add space comes as a surprise, it is a welcome one. A smaller central library never made sense. Advocates have long cited increasing library usage throughout DC, the US and around the world, as well as the growing number of nontraditional library uses that the public favors: gathering spaces, gallery and exhibition space, collaborative spaces for co-creating, high-quality auditoriums for a range of performance, retail spaces such as a Friends of the Library store (which MLK used to have), restaurants and coffee shops, schools, theatre companies, music and dance academies, rehearsal space, daycare, workplace development centers, research centers,
centers for writers and spaces dedicated to seniors. Anyone who has seen the Ballou High School marching band at practice in MLK’s basement realizes the building’s unlimited potential to serve and supplement educational needs.

Now that we have arrived at a moment of political will for a renovation and have begun looking at the building more creatively, DCPL has found that more space, not less, is required, exactly as advocates have asserted. DCPL has said it can support whatever uses are chosen for the library, including through partnerships. The MLK Library Friends is supportive of this conclusion and believes that in fact other public agency missions, consistent with the library’s purpose, should also be explored.

**Addition and the Need for a Fifth Alternative**

From an historic preservation viewpoint, the most rational alternative for an addition—an extension of the building exactly as it exists—was not presented. Such an extension was envisioned by the architect and the building was structurally engineered to support it (two-three floors). Moreover, a contemporary rendering by the Freelon Group was presented to the Library Trustees by the Urban Land Institute in 2012. Therefore, we believe a fifth alternative should be added. Alternative Five would allow an expansion of one to three floors, for library and other related public purposes found to be appropriate.

![Two additional floors (total six above ground) as envisioned by Mies Rendering by The Freelon Group, 2012](image)

The library has finally come to the realization that what we already have is extremely valuable—as an iconic architectural structure which could for that reason alone be a magnet for tourists. The Moshe Safdie-designed Salt Lake City central library is the largest tourist attraction in Utah.

**Openness, Transparency and Light**

The 2000 Board of Library Trustees-commissioned study, led by Kent Cooper of the AIA Urban Design Committee, identified the lack of light in the interior of the building as a major deterrent to use and enjoyment of the MLK Library by the public. In addition, the black tinted glass skin presents a psychological barrier to use. Passersby and library users, too, often describe the building as looking somber, ominous and depressing from the outside.
We therefore welcome all the design elements proposed that increase natural light into the building. This includes redesign of the building’s “cores” to be glass enclosed, as well as the creation of exterior light wells in the pavement around the MLK Library building.

The conversion of the loading dock to interior space is another welcome concept. In addition to reclaiming needed space for public use, it will provide visibility through the center of the building from G Street to Tenth Place, greatly adding light and openness on the entry level, which is surrounded by a loggia that reduces light. Plans also show reader spaces at the perimeters of the building, a common-sense practice and an example followed by libraries world-wide, along the windows on each floor.

Replacing Brick with Glass

The MLK Library Friends also supports the removal of all brick walls—interior and exterior—and replacement with glass where necessary. Greatly increasing the transparency of the building will not only increase light, but it will also help draw people into the library, as well as share interior liveliness with the streetscape.

Some of the brick elements have protected status as part of the historic landmark status of the building, but openness is a hallmark of the Modern architecture era and of Mies’ designs in particular. Many significant Mies buildings designed for cultural and educational purposes—including the Neue Nationalgalerie in Berlin and Crown Hall at the Illinois Institute of Technology—have walls made entirely of glass.
The MLK Library historical records show that brick was introduced only after marble specified by Mies was eliminated due to budget constraints. While we understand that buildings are landmarked as built, it is critically important to use this once in a lifetime opportunity for renovation of the MLK Library to make reasonable adaptations that will increase the appreciation and use of this public building and bolster its continued funding. Marble, had it been used, would be as lacking in transparency as brick, but worth saving for its beauty and association with grandeur. The brick, however, feels cheap and paltry in this setting, as indeed it is a substitute mandated by budget cuts. We endorse the replacement of brick with glass throughout.

Atrium and Reading Room

Many longtime library advocates were inspired by the multi-story atrium proposed by Kent Cooper in the 2000 study.
The revelation of the Kent Cooper plan was finding the large clear-span area in the center of the building that could be used to create a grand Main Reading Room under the skylight. A great library needs a great reading room, where anyone can sit in an inspirational setting, to read, study, and dream, but the renovation plans currently do not show one.

Using an atrium to create a Main Reading Room on the second floor, or higher, while still keeping the Great Hall intact under its landmark status, would add an essential element that was lacking. We highly recommend some version of the atrium design—whether multi-story or a single story to bring more natural light to library spaces, especially the center of the building—being incorporated into the renovation plans.

**Roof Use**

During the selection process, the firm of Patkau/Ayers Saint Gross submitted the concept of an interior courtyard on an atrium roof level as the design for an addition, be it one, two or three floors. It would be symmetrical and straightforward like the rest of the building but with some of the interior volume carved out. An interior courtyard would address concerns about trees or shrubbery being seen from the ground that some have expressed, although the MLK Library Friends does not object to trees being visible. We would support live plants throughout an outdoor interior courtyard on the atrium roof level and use of green space by the public as a park with an outdoor reading room and cafes.

The ultimate design of roof areas should contribute to the city’s goals for sustainability. Time and again library users and residents have said they want to see maximum environmental forward thinking in their public buildings. MLK Library Friends is interested in such things as green roofs, stormwater management, teaching gardens, butterfly gardens, planting for native birds and pollinators, reduction of the heat island effect, and possible energy generation through solar and wind capture. We are also interested in reducing bird deaths from crashing into reflective glass and want to ensure MLK Library is renovated with “birdproof” glass.
Resolution
With regard to the renovation of the
Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library

Whereas the District has fully funded the transformation of 16 neighborhood libraries through public dollars;

Whereas the District is in a strong financial position, with over $1 billion in its rainy day fund;

Whereas the increase in population in the District suggests that reserving or increasing, not reducing, public space for future use is advisable;

Whereas the MLK, Jr. Memorial Library is a designated historic landmark;

Whereas the MLK, Jr. Memorial Library is structurally engineered to support the addition of one or two stories only;

Whereas additional construction would be cost prohibitive as well as controversial under historic preservation laws;

Whereas the District has ongoing needs for public space—including additional library space and space for public institutions such as the DC Archives—but no plan for or systematic evaluation of those needs exists;

Therefore be it resolved that the MLK Library Friends requests the development of a full analysis of the potential for the MLK, Jr. Memorial Library building, including, first and foremost, the needs for expanded services of the library itself.

Be it further resolved that in this analysis the MLK Library Friends requests consideration of co-locating related public institutions such as the DC Archives, to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library site;

Be it further resolved that this might necessitate the addition of one or two floors to the historic building as provided by architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe in the original design;

Be it finally resolved that the MLK Library Friends requests that city officials authorize full public funding of the renovation—without additional for-profit commercial or residential development.

Passed unanimously October 21, 2014
Wendy Blair, Secretary
October 28, 2014

Email: jennifer.hirsch@ncpc.gov

National Capital Planning Commission
Attn: Jennifer Hirsch
Suite 500 North
401 9th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004

Re: Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library Renovation and Expansion
(Project: #7610)

Dear Ms. Hirsch:

The Downtown Artists Coalition (DAC) respectfully submits the following comments on the renovation of Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library (MLK Library). The comments are limited to proposals to add one or more floors. The DAC’s mission is to preserve and foster artist's studio spaces in the District of Columbia. In the process, the DAC has also worked with developers, city officials and preservationists on the broader issue of preserving the city’s historic fabric while reinvigorating the downtown landscape. MLK Library has been a topic of continued interest.

The DAC supports renovation of MLK Library in a fashion that addresses the current and future needs of the community. The DAC would prefer that the building remain four stories for aesthetic reasons, namely retaining the current balance of its mass, color and texture against other buildings in the immediate vicinity.

The DAC does not oppose the addition of one story if deemed necessary for the library’s space needs. However, we would only endorse a continuation of the Mies design. There should be no other alternative.

Adding a story or two to a Mies building is highly unusual, perhaps never done. Going one step further and adding an incongruous structure designed by another architect is viewed by many as shocking. The world is watching.

The solution has always been at the Library’s fingertips. Mies himself noted that MLK Library could be expanded by a floor or two if extra space was needed. There was no confusion as to the meaning of this statement – simply add another Mies floor.
The confusion seems to lie with a rigid application of the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation*, a guidance document intended to insure that new additions do not “destroy historic materials that characterize the property.” This has been interpreted by many as imposing a mandate that the addition be “distinguishably different.” MLK Library provides the opportunity to clarify that the *Standards*’ ultimate goal would be best achieved by allowing the original architect’s vision to be fulfilled. This was accomplished with Saarinen’s Dulles Airport expansion.

Four proposals were submitted to the NCPC but none included the option provided by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. This seems disrespectful for a building that has gained landmark status and is the architect’s only structure in Washington, DC. Perhaps there is another reason – the concept proposals are closely tied to Washington’s approach when considering preservation issues. It is a starkly different approach than other cities would undertake, such as Chicago, Mies’ hometown in the United States.

Washington may be at the forefront of protecting buildings and neighborhoods. The city is filled with the rich fabric of its architectural history. It can be a complex quilt displaying both preserved and new construction. Its aesthetic is founded on the principal of compromise: retain the past while embracing the new.

Chicago has also battled to preserve its heritage while fighting to innovate. While some torn-down buildings may have been better architectural statements than their replacements, the city has generally favored one architect’s vision rather than preserving fabric by comingling “distinguishably different” ideas by other architects. It is a singular aesthetic.

Chicago and Washington have very different opportunities and restrictions with respect to land development. Washington has austere height limits. It is also a bit more landlocked in terms of the size of its downtown. While Chicago is larger, it still faces the same ultimate choice on whether to preserve an older building, tear it down, or create a hybrid building. Chicago tends to select from the first two options when contemplating new construction.

In Washington, many older downtown buildings were only three, four or five stories high. As owners attempted to develop their valuable air rights, there was pressure to find solutions through “facademies” or partial incorporation of historic structures including the structures’ facades. Some of the early results were awkward, but later refinements created the complex tapestry that is the current downtown. It also created an aesthetic based on the principle of “distinguishably different.”

Chicago did not have the same pressure to extend existing buildings since many older buildings were already developed to the optimal economic height and developers pursued other properties. Facademies and partial incorporation of historic structures has not been an adopted aesthetic.

Washington also tends to employ so-called “wrap-around buildings.” Most of Chicago is based on a strict grid system. Right angles are superimposed on the streets and buildings. Unless geography intervenes, the grid produces building lots that are square or rectangular.
Diagonals intersperse the Washington grid, creating a more dynamic city layout than Chicago. Washington is not disciplined, however, when it comes to building sites. The plot does not have to be a square, rectangle or triangle. Rather, it is acceptable to combine adjoining sites and incorporate historic fabric in order to construct a project. End result: irrational floorplates based on economics rather than aesthetics, with stepped-back heights distinguishing historic versus new material.

For architectural purists, these wrap-around buildings can be an anathema. This is especially the case when the building’s floorplate or set-backs signal to the viewer that the architectural design was based on a compromise. But that is not to say that it is impossible to design a superb wrap-around building. That is Washington’s challenge since developers assemble plots of land as available within the height restrictions and preservationists fight to retain historic fabric.

The result of Washington’s different approach to aesthetics than Chicago’s approach goes far to explain the approach to MLK Library. It may explain why Washington has entertained brainstorming sessions for several years on how to reinvent the building. Architects have been invited to submit their ideas for a distinctly different addition. There has been public discussion, including by some within the preservation community, about the opportunity to make the building less austere, add a bit of dynamism, plant trees on the roof and the like. Why not, since the city is filled with buildings based on the “distinguishably different” compromise?

Coming from another city like Chicago, however, the architectural exercises may be viewed with disdain. One does not compromise a Mies building. Furthermore, many have been aghast that Mies’ own proposal was not submitted to the NCPC.

It is within this context that we must consider application of the Secretary’s Standards to MLK Library. There should be no misreading on how the Standards are applied. The Standards cannot be interpreted as forbidding completion of the Mies vision while approving a second architect’s design. That is counter-intuitive and there is no better example than MLK Library to confirm that this was not the Standards’ intention.

The DAC urges that the NCPC consider the Mies design for a fifth floor extension within its NEPA and Section 106 consultation process.

Sincerely,

Michael Berman
President
Downtown Artists Coalition
Hi Jennifer,

I'm a citizen of DC and I'm writing to let you know I support the current plan for renovating DC's MLK Library.

I support the current design because I think DC will benefit from more iconic, contemporary architecture that complements our beautiful city. As someone who works with libraries around the world to become true centers of community activity, I also support this design because I think it positions the library to better serve as a hub of community life for DC residents.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Best Regards,

Matt Vanderwerff