



## APPENDIX F

### TRANSCRIPTS FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS



1 GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

2 Zoning Commission

3

4

5

6 Smithsonian Institution South Mall Plan

7 Public Meeting

8

9

10

11

12 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

13 Monday, December 11, 2017

14

15 National Capital Planning Commission

16 401 9th Street, NW

17 Suite 500N

18 Washington, D.C. 20004

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MS. KOSTER: Okay. Well, we're going to  
3 go ahead and get started. I always like to start  
4 meetings when we say we're going to start them.  
5 It honors the folks that found the location and  
6 got here on time.

7 So, welcome. This is the first of two  
8 public meetings regarding the Draft Environmental  
9 Impact Statement for the Smithsonian Institution  
10 South Mall Campus Master Plan.

11 On behalf of the National Capital  
12 Planning Commission and the Smithsonian, welcome.  
13 We really appreciate your participation in this  
14 process.

15 I'm Julia Koster. I'll be moderating  
16 tonight as we go through, and I wanted to cover a  
17 couple of logistics. If you need the bathrooms,  
18 they are located outside the lobby, down the hall  
19 on the right north hand side. There is a code for  
20 the women's restroom that's out front in the  
21 receptionist area.

22 I'll note that copies of the Draft

1 Environmental Impact Statement and many other  
2 resource documents are available online on  
3 dedicated pages on NCPC's web site. That's  
4 [www.ncpc.gov/projects/southmall/](http://www.ncpc.gov/projects/southmall/), and at the  
5 Smithsonian's web site,  
6 [www.southmallcampus.si.edu](http://www.southmallcampus.si.edu).

7 Today's meeting is being live streamed.  
8 It will also be transcribed. The video of this  
9 meeting and the next public meeting will be  
10 available on NCPC's web site in about three to  
11 five business days.

12 Today, your comments and questions will  
13 be recorded so that they can be formally  
14 considered in the NEPA process. So as we go  
15 through this, I'll make sure you're all reminded  
16 of that as we move forward.

17 There are a number of other ways to  
18 provide comments in this process. There are handy  
19 comment cards available up front. They have this  
20 nice blue header on them. You can submit those  
21 tonight or at any time through the comment period.

22 As I mentioned, there's another public

1 meeting next Monday, December 18th at 10:00 a.m.  
2 right back here in NCPC's commission chambers.  
3 You can submit your comments online, again, at the  
4 web page for the Smithsonian, and all of that  
5 information is included on the comment card, in  
6 case you're not able to write that down quite as  
7 quickly.

8           You can also mail in comments to either  
9 Matt Flis at NCPC or Michelle Spofford at the  
10 Smithsonian. Their names and addresses are also  
11 included on the comment card and are available on  
12 the web site. Comments on this project are being  
13 accepted through January 18th, 2018.

14           So I'll note there are several different  
15 review processes under way for this project,  
16 including the review of the campus master plan by  
17 NCPC, Section 106, Review for Historic  
18 Preservation and Environmental Review as required  
19 by the National Environmental Policy Act.

20           This meeting focuses on the environmental  
21 review. Later in the meeting, there will be  
22 involved on how those three processes fit together

1 to help inform your participation in all of those  
2 processes.

3           So let's talk just a little bit about the  
4 format for tonight's meeting. We'll start with a  
5 short presentation on the South Mall master plan  
6 including the purpose and need for the project.  
7 Then we'll have presentations on the alternatives  
8 and related environmental impacts.

9           After each alternative is presented,  
10 we'll give you the opportunity to ask questions or  
11 make comments alternative by alternative. We'll  
12 take about 10 minutes more or less for each  
13 alternative. That way, you don't have to remember  
14 three alternatives back.

15           I will be keeping an eye on the time  
16 while we're going through that, just to make sure  
17 we can get through all the alternatives in the  
18 scheduled amount of time.

19           And we'll also, after the last  
20 alternative is presented, you can share comments  
21 or ask questions about any of the alternatives.

22           So with that, I think we'll turn it over

1 and start the program, and I'll ask Ann Trowbridge  
2 to come up and present the overview of the South  
3 Mall Campus master plan.

4 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Julia, and  
5 thank you all for coming.

6 I know for many of you -- have been to  
7 many of our public meetings for the Section 106  
8 process to date, and we thank you for coming to  
9 get another meeting or listening in to the live  
10 webcast.

11 I just wanted to -- as Julia mentioned,  
12 these are where comments go to Matt Flis or  
13 Michelle Spofford, and they're -- you can make  
14 comments on the web site.

15 Here is our agenda for tonight with  
16 individual discussions of each alternative and  
17 some of the elements common to all alternatives.

18 We are talking about the South Mall  
19 Campus stretching from 12th Street to 7th Street  
20 between Independence and the National Mall, here  
21 outlined in red. This project is a master plan  
22 rather than a specific design.



1           It sets the overall goals and describes  
2 the circulation and the systems that will tie our  
3 five buildings and multiple gardens together.  
4 Each individual project that comes in the next 20  
5 or more years of implementing this plan will have  
6 a separate review process with the external  
7 agencies, the CFA and NCPC as well as a Section  
8 106 process and required permitting from DDOT or  
9 DOEE and other required processes for building  
10 projects.

11           So this is really to set the general  
12 character for development of the site and will be  
13 the document by which NCPC evaluates the  
14 individual project designs that come its way in  
15 the future.

16           Our goals are multiple. We've gone  
17 through these many times before with those of you  
18 who have attended before. I think first and  
19 foremost, we had a number of buildings that  
20 require restoration and renovation, first and  
21 foremost the Castle building, which will be the  
22 first major project on our master plan

1 implementation.

2           We had roofs that need replacement,  
3 including the roof of the Quadrangle Building. We  
4 had mechanical systems at the end of their useful  
5 life, particularly, the Castle, the Quadrangle  
6 Building and Hirshhorn. We have just finished a  
7 major overhaul of the systems at the Freer Gallery  
8 of Art.

9           We want to improve access to people with  
10 disabilities. We want to improve in general, the  
11 connectivity and circulation within the campus and  
12 to the mall and the South West Eco District.

13           It's very important to our museum  
14 constituents, the Sackler Gallery and African Art  
15 is to have their entrances be more visible from  
16 both the Castle and the National Mall.

17           We want to create and link visitor and  
18 education spaces. We have a significant shortage  
19 of space in both those areas, and we want them  
20 linked because they more and more share needs and  
21 we want visitors to be able to seamlessly connect  
22 between amenities like coffee service and

1 educational classrooms and visitor information.

2           We want to increase the amount of space  
3 available for museums and events and programs. We  
4 want to establish a new utility plant -- a central  
5 utility plant that would replace the GSA chilled  
6 water and steam that we now rely on. This  
7 represents a major reduction in both annual  
8 operating costs as well as greenhouse gas  
9 emissions and energy consumption.

10           We want to improve and expand our  
11 underground loading space. The South Mall will  
12 have more food service, more gallery space. Both  
13 of those demand improvements to loading and some  
14 separation of those loading areas. The expanded  
15 loading will also help us accommodate some of the  
16 extra equipment that Smithsonian Gardens now  
17 disguises in nooks and crannies around the South  
18 Mall.

19           We also will be updating our perimeter  
20 and building security. Most of what you see now,  
21 for instance, at the Freer Gallery, is of a  
22 temporary nature and we want to improve that and

1 make it good looking.

2           We are here as part of the requirements  
3 of the National Environmental Policy Act, the  
4 NEPA. We are preparing an environmental impact  
5 statement. We are -- which -- in which the NCPC  
6 is the lead federal agency.

7           We are considering alternatives and  
8 factoring environmental considerations into our  
9 decision-making.

10           This is an outline of that process, and  
11 we are step four, the public review of the draft  
12 EIS. That will end in mid-January. We will then  
13 respond to the comments we've received, prepare a  
14 final EIS and that will eventually lead to the  
15 preparation of a record of decision for the  
16 project, which will be provided to NCPC who will  
17 take the lead in acting on that when they approve  
18 the master plan.

19           We have also been engaged in a Section  
20 106 process that is intertwined and parallel to  
21 the NEPA process. We actually began that at an  
22 earlier date than we developed the draft EIS so

1 that the Section 106 would have the opportunity to  
2 impact the development of all alternatives for the  
3 project.

4 And it has, indeed, done that, we think  
5 quite effectively. We have gone from our initial  
6 Smithsonian Preferred Alternative D to considering  
7 Alternative B as well as evolving an Alternative F  
8 that we think represents the best direction from  
9 the Smithsonian standpoint. And that alternative  
10 has benefited substantially from the input of the  
11 public in this process.

12 Our next step is to draft a programmatic  
13 agreement for the Section 106 process, and that  
14 will be the subject of a meeting later this  
15 winter. Those of you on our mailing list who have  
16 been coming to consult the parties meeting will  
17 receive an invitation to that.

18 I'd now like to turn over the floor to  
19 Aran Coakley from BIG, our project design  
20 architects. They have been with the Smithsonian  
21 project for several years now, and he will present  
22 the alternatives, and Liz Estes of Stantec

1 (phonetic 00:14:20) will join him in describing  
2 the environmental impacts.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. COAKLEY: Hello. Aran Coakley from  
5 BIG.

6 So what we wanted to do is review a basic  
7 summary of the alternatives that are being  
8 considered as part of the EIS. Now we have more  
9 alternatives we've looked at, but we have narrowed  
10 the alternatives down to these three: It's  
11 Alternative B, Alternative D, Alternative F and  
12 the No-Action serving is the baseline.

13 Alternative B was modified through our  
14 public process meetings, and Alternative D was the  
15 original master plan that had been reviewed, I  
16 think starting back in 2014, December. That was  
17 the initial one.

18 And then Alternative F has integrated  
19 many of the public comments as well as trying to  
20 balance those with the goals and objectives and  
21 the purpose, indeed, of Smithsonian's  
22 requirements.

1           So we'll start with the No-Action. No-  
2 Action is pretty much keeping the campus as is  
3 with as required maintenance. So the Haupt Garden  
4 will be -- the roof of this will be patched as  
5 required. Continued maintenance of mechanical  
6 systems for the Castle, the Freer, AIB, Hirshhorn.  
7 So general maintenance, but at the most basic  
8 level to keep it open and serviceable.

9           As you can see here, this is a below  
10 grade view of the South Mall Campus. The quad in  
11 this area would undergo no change. And this is  
12 our summary of how the No-Action addresses the  
13 purpose and need.

14           And as you can see here, outdated  
15 mechanical system; currently, each building has  
16 its own mechanical system. There's no unified  
17 system for that, so it increases the maintenance  
18 as well as -- has some reliability issues, because  
19 many of these systems are towards the end of their  
20 life span.

21           Visitors. When visitors visit the  
22 Castle, they often expect to have a connection to

1 the wider units of the Smithsonian. Currently,  
2 the Castle experience is somewhat isolated and not  
3 well connected to the other buildings or the other  
4 museums of the South Mall Campus.

5           The Quadrangle roof -- there are current  
6 leaks in that roof that need to be addressed.  
7 We'll continue just addressing them piecemeal, but  
8 this is not talking about a systemic repair of the  
9 roof.

10           Loading. The current loading facility at  
11 the Quad as well as at the Hirshhorn -- they're  
12 not sized to handle many of the exhibit pieces as  
13 well as the delivery trucks that are required, so  
14 we often have street side delivery for collection  
15 pieces that -- it's certainly not at the quality  
16 that a world-class museum should have.

17           Circulation. There is quite a bit of  
18 confusion with how to navigate through the campus  
19 at the moment. Most visitors are coming in from  
20 the mall side, and there have been comments that  
21 it's difficult to find the Sackler and the African  
22 Art building. And then this also has no overall



1 restoration of the Castle.

2           The Smithsonian very much wants to be a  
3 good steward of the Castle, so currently, this is  
4 not meeting the purpose and need, but it does set  
5 the baseline and it allows us to identify some of  
6 the issues that we're trying to address.

7           A diagrammatic section north, south  
8 through the campus. Seventy-five percent of the  
9 visitors come through the mall side. This is from  
10 analyses that Smithsonian has done on visitorship;  
11 a smaller portion from independents. One of the  
12 ideas from this analysis is that we want to have  
13 better visibility for the African Art and Sackler  
14 Museums from the mall, so people can find those  
15 museums.

16           The current below grade condition:  
17 The Quad is quite a vast below grade building with  
18 a mixture of programs. There's loading on the B-1  
19 that's connecting to the current loading ramp.  
20 Collection spaces are also on this first floor  
21 condition as well as museums, and as you can see,  
22 there's a mixture of office, collections, museum

1 spaces as well as at the very bottom, education.  
2 It's not a very well lit space and it's somewhat  
3 difficult to find your way through that. These  
4 are all things that we're looking to address with  
5 the master plan.

6           So I'll let Liz take over from here.  
7 Just so everyone knows, we're going to be passing  
8 this baton back and forth for each one of these  
9 alternatives.

10           MS. ESTES: Thank you, Aran.

11           I'll be going over the impacts to -- from  
12 the No-Action Alternative. In regards to cultural  
13 resources, the No-Action Alternative focuses on  
14 basic repair and maintenance, like Aran had said,  
15 but the lack of a coordinated approach to  
16 stabilizing, repairing and protecting resources on  
17 the campus would make them vulnerable to continue  
18 deterioration or future seismic or blast events  
19 resulting in a moderate adverse impact.

20           For visual resources, there would be no  
21 major above-grade changes and no impact to visual  
22 resources would occur.

1           With the No-Action Alternative, there  
2   would be no major excavation of soils. The soils  
3   in the Haupt Garden would be temporarily displaced  
4   during the repair to the existing roof membrane of  
5   the Quad.

6           This would result in direct and indirect  
7   short-term negligible adverse impacts. After the  
8   Quadrangle roof has been repaired, soils would be  
9   re-used or replaced with soils of a similar type.  
10   Therefore, there would be no direct or indirect  
11   long-term impacts.

12           No changes would occur to the  
13   configuration of the existing storm water system;  
14   therefore, there would be no new direct impacts  
15   from storm water runoff. Construction activities  
16   related to the repair to the roof of the  
17   Quadrangle Building would cause increased soil  
18   erosion that could travel off-site.

19           A limited ability to retain and filter  
20   storm water on-site would continue. The No-Action  
21   Alternative would result in indirect, short-term  
22   negligible and minor long-term adverse impacts.

1           Repairs to the Quadrangle Building would  
2   generate fugitive dust and construction equipment  
3   would generate volatile organic compounds and  
4   nitrous oxides, creating short-term minor adverse  
5   impacts to air quality. Outdated mechanical  
6   systems would not be replaced with modern units.

7           The antiquated mechanical systems  
8   contribute to indoor air quality issues and would  
9   result in direct, long-term, minor adverse  
10   impacts. No indirect impacts would occur.

11           There would be no seismic retrofits  
12   performed and buildings would remain vulnerable to  
13   seismic activity. If future seismic events occur,  
14   the Castle and the AIB would likely experience  
15   damage. Without any seismic retrofits, there is a  
16   potential risk to human life in the event of a  
17   future earthquake.

18           There would also be the potential for an  
19   economic impact from the potential loss of  
20   collections and buildings. This would result in  
21   long-term, major adverse impacts.

22           Due to the age of some of the buildings

1 within the South Mall Campus, asbestos and lead-  
2 based paint are likely to be present. Removal of  
3 asbestos and lead-based paint would occur during  
4 basic building maintenance, resulting in minor  
5 short-term adverse impacts and long-term  
6 beneficial impacts.

7           With the No-Action Alternative, no safety  
8 or security upgrades would be made to the South  
9 Mall Campus. Seismic vulnerability of the Castle  
10 and AIB present a major risk to human life and an  
11 economic impact. There would be no indirect  
12 impacts.

13           The continued use of GSA steam and  
14 chilled water and antiquated mechanical systems  
15 results in increased emissions which would have a  
16 direct negligible long-term adverse impact to  
17 greenhouse gas emissions.

18           The demand for energy from existing  
19 inefficient mechanical systems and older buildings  
20 would result in short and long-term indirect  
21 negligible adverse impacts to climate change.

22           There would be no changes to the South

1 Mall Campus layout, way-finding, pathway  
2 configuration or view sheds under the No-Action  
3 Alternative. Therefore, there would be no direct  
4 or indirect impacts to land-use planning or  
5 policies.

6           The No-Action Alternative represents a  
7 continuation of the existing use and experience  
8 provided by the Smithsonian. Visitors would  
9 continue to be able to access the museums and  
10 gardens within the South Mall Campus, but no clear  
11 east-west pedestrian connection would be created  
12 and way-finding would not be improved.

13           Furthermore, access and visibility from  
14 the National Mall would not be improved. These  
15 impacts would be direct, moderate, long-term and  
16 adverse. The implementation of the Southwest  
17 Ecodistrict could increase visitorships, but  
18 visitor services would not be enhanced resulting  
19 in indirect long-term adverse impact. During  
20 constructions, there would also be closures to  
21 exhibits that would impact visitor use and  
22 experience.

1           With the No-Action Alternative, no  
2 changes to GSAM PEPCO or D.C. Water Utility  
3 Supplies would occur; therefore, no changes to  
4 utility demands would occur. However, the  
5 continued need to repair mechanical systems would  
6 have short-term minor adverse impacts on  
7 utilities.

8           New sustainability measures would be  
9 implemented which would continue to cause long-  
10 term minor adverse impact on utilities. Energy  
11 consumption may increase as mechanical systems  
12 continue to age and become less efficient.

13           The South Mall Campus would also remain  
14 on GSA steam and chilled water, which could  
15 potentially result in deterioration of museum  
16 artifacts and artwork over time.

17           Minimal construction waste would be  
18 generated under the No-Action Alternative. Waste  
19 would continue to be generated at its current  
20 level, and collections, delivery and distribution  
21 would continue to share space with food and waste  
22 streams, increasing the risk of damage or

1 deterioration of collection items over time  
2 resulting in indirect minor, long-term adverse  
3 impacts. No direct impacts would occur.

4           With the No-Action Alternative, no new  
5 vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian or transit trips  
6 would be generated if the Smithsonian did not  
7 implement the master plan for the South Mall  
8 Campus. In addition, there would not be a new  
9 consolidated loading dock for the campus. The use  
10 of the three existing loading docks would continue  
11 to have a long-term moderate adverse impact on  
12 traffic surrounding the South Mall Campus.

13           And this slide gives a summary of the  
14 impacts to -- as a result of the No-Action  
15 Alternative. It is also provided in the hand-out  
16 out in the lobby.

17           And I think now we will turn it over for  
18 any comments on the No-Action Alternative.

19           MS. KOSTER: So what I will say, this is  
20 the time you set aside. If you have comments or  
21 questions, I think it would help if anybody has  
22 clarifying questions that they'd like to ask about



1 the No-Action Alternatives. Yes?

2 And can I ask -- there's a button down  
3 below. Click it and there you go. It should turn  
4 red. And just state your name and --

5 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: My name is Steve  
6 McLoughlin (phonetic 00:26:39) and my question is  
7 about the structural analysis and the threat of  
8 seismic damage.

9 Is the Quadrangle Building especially  
10 susceptible, or is the main concern about the  
11 Castle?

12 MR. COAKLEY: It's primarily the Castle  
13 that's the most susceptible. It's the nature of  
14 its construction as well as its geometry makes it  
15 particularly susceptible to seismic actions.

16 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: Thank you.

17 SPEAKER: (inaudible 00:27:09) Committee  
18 100. Is that seismic report -- I know it's been  
19 under way? Is it finished now? Has it been  
20 completed?

21 MR. COAKLEY: We're in the process of  
22 putting that together. There is a preliminary

1 seismic analysis that was done three years ago,  
2 and that's what this initial master plan was  
3 derived from, and now we are doing a more thorough  
4 one that's in process right now.

5 SPEAKER: I don't think anyone is arguing  
6 with you on the issue of the vulnerability.

7 MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

8 SPEAKER: Particularly given the  
9 construction on all the parts that stick up.  
10 There is a good technical term for you.

11 I guess, but the question is, will the  
12 final report talk about base-isolation versus cable  
13 (phonetic 00:27:52) bracing? Will a  
14 recommendation come out of that, or is the report  
15 ultimately going to say it's vulnerable?

16 MR. COAKLEY: We already know it's  
17 vulnerable from the initial report, so this is  
18 analyzing the best method to protect the Castle  
19 through a restoration. So there will be  
20 recommendations out of it, but those have to be  
21 balanced against preserving the historic nature of  
22 the Castle.

1           So you know, we will be trying to see  
2   which method has the least amount of intervention  
3   to the historic fabric.

4           SPEAKER: Do you expect the report will  
5   make a recommendation as to that? I mean,  
6   generally, historic buildings of that size and  
7   scale do better with say, base-isolation as  
8   opposed to internal bracing. We have to tear off  
9   all the interior spaces.

10           Is it Silman and Associates going to be  
11   doing that?

12           MR. COAKLEY: It's going to be Silman  
13   that's doing that; yes.

14           SPEAKER: Okay.

15           MR. COAKLEY: But we're also working with  
16   the Historic Preservation Team at Smithsonian to  
17   help guide us through that, as well. So it's  
18   going to be two-pronged: One from a structural  
19   standpoint and one from a historic preservation  
20   standpoint.

21           SPEAKER: Thank you.

22           MS. KOSTER: Okay. Are there any other

1 questions right now on the No-Action Alternative?

2 (No response heard)

3 MS. KOSTER: Great. I would also  
4 encourage -- I know we had some folks come in  
5 late. You are welcome to come up front. If you  
6 prefer staying where you are, we have folks that  
7 can run a mic to you, so that's always an option.  
8 So keep that in mind.

9 The views are very nice, though, from  
10 this side of the dais. So with that, we'll turn  
11 it over to look at the next alternative.

12 MS. ESTES: Right now, we're going to  
13 look at all the action alternatives, but first,  
14 we'd like to go over -- in the EIS, we dismissed  
15 several topics from further analysis. They are --  
16 an analysis is in there, but they are not analyzed  
17 further in the EIS because they have no to  
18 negligible effect on the environment, and these  
19 include geology, wildlife and vegetation,  
20 threatened and endangered species, ground water  
21 and hydrology, surface water and wetlands, flood  
22 plains, coastal zone management, archaeological

1 resources, noise, community facilities and  
2 services, population and housing, economy and  
3 employment and environmental justice.

4 MR. COAKLEY: So this is just going to be  
5 a brief recap of the common to all components for  
6 the action alternatives. I'll just walk you  
7 through it.

8 Loading facility. This is to give the  
9 campus adequate loading so we can handle those  
10 collections, as well as getting some  
11 differentiation between food delivery, trash,  
12 recycling and collections. So that's a much  
13 needed component and that is 12th Street, this  
14 loading ramp that we're noting here.

15 Now part of that, in order to do this  
16 larger loading dock and ramp condition will  
17 involve removing the Ripley Pavilion.

18 As was spoken about before, Castle  
19 Restoration, which is also going to be involving  
20 seismic retrofits of the Castle. That's something  
21 we're in the process of studying.

22 Removal of the old Sackler loading ramp.

1 That will be consolidated to this area. Also, the  
2 AIB loading area -- we're also looking to  
3 consolidate that. So this whole portion of the  
4 campus will be serviced by that central loading  
5 plant, allowing better east-west circulation as  
6 well as accessible entry.

7           So currently, there is a handicapped  
8 entry for the Freer on Independence. It's for the  
9 back of house entry. We're looking to add an  
10 accessible entry on the east side of the Freer.  
11 That will then also allow a circulation path  
12 across the campus.

13           We're also looking to remove the loading  
14 doors at AIB to allow a connection to the Freer.  
15 And you can see here a small removal of the  
16 Hirshhorn's Plaza wall to facilitate that east-  
17 west circulation.

18           Below grade, as I was speaking about --  
19 this is the loading ramp as well as the loading  
20 dock. We are looking to limit the loading dock to  
21 the west side, the west range and the commons area  
22 at the Castle and all of the alternatives.

1           And then here, we're also noting from a  
2   to be decided central utility plant. The location  
3   of that varies depending on which alternative that  
4   we're looking at, but a utility chase that brings  
5   the Hirshhorn into the central utility plant  
6   surfaces.

7           (Pause)

8           MS. ESTES: This slide shows the impacts  
9   on cultural resources. This is also provided in  
10  your handout to be able to read it a little  
11  easier. And they've been organized by resource.

12           In most cases, the impacts on the  
13  Smithsonian Quadrangle Historic District are the  
14  same as those on the National Mall Historic  
15  District and their contributing resources, a  
16  majority of interventions common to all  
17  alternatives focused maintenance and repair and  
18  will result in beneficial impacts.

19           There is a potential for adverse impact  
20  resulting from the perimeter of security, the new  
21  consolidated loading dock, the central utility  
22  plant, seismic bracing of the Castle and

1 replacement of the Quadrangle roof membrane.

2           The direct impacts are long-term, minor  
3 and adverse, and there are also long-term  
4 beneficial impacts to cultural resources.

5           (Pause)

6           MS. ESTES: Similarly, elements common to  
7 all alternatives have the potential for adverse  
8 impacts on visual resources subject to continued  
9 design development. In all action alternatives,  
10 the removal of the Ripley Pavilion represents a  
11 beneficial impact by restoring the viewship  
12 between the Mall and the Quadrangle.

13           The direct impacts would be negligible to  
14 minor in nature and adverse. There would also be  
15 long-term beneficial impacts.

16           Soils would be excavated 20 to 30 feet  
17 beneath the footprint of the Castle under all of  
18 the alternatives. As with the no action  
19 alternative, soils in the Haupt Garden would be  
20 temporarily displaced during the repair to the  
21 existing roof membrane of the Quadrangle Building.

22           Under all of the action alternatives, the



1 Ripley Garden would be expanded. That would  
2 require minor grading, leveling and soil  
3 disturbance. These activities would result in  
4 short-term minor direct and negligible indirect  
5 adverse impacts to soils.

6           The activities would also permanently  
7 remove soils, and the topography of the site would  
8 be permanently altered from the construction of  
9 the new loading ramp creating a direct minor long-  
10 term adverse impact to soils and topography. The  
11 soils would be added to expand the Ripley Garden  
12 were none exist right now.

13           Declaring a vegetation and green space  
14 during construction would temporarily reduce the  
15 site's ability to absorb storm water, which would  
16 increase the amount of storm water on the site.

17           In comparison to the existing conditions,  
18 the amount of impervious surface overall would be  
19 reduced allowing for storm water to be absorbed.  
20 The Haupt Garden would continue to function as a  
21 green roof. Pervious pavers, bioretention areas  
22 and additional plantings would be added where

1 possible.

2           The storm water systems on-site would be  
3 upgraded including the use of cisterns to capture  
4 and store storm water, and storm water would be  
5 reused to irrigate the campus or to flush toilets.  
6 The indirect and direct impacts resulting from the  
7 actions common to all master plan alternatives  
8 would have minor short-term adverse impacts and  
9 moderate long-term beneficial impacts.

10           Under all of the action alternatives, the  
11 Castle would be retrofitted using base-isolation  
12 and traditional cross-basing methods. Base-  
13 isolation of the Castle would limit the forces  
14 that a seismic event would have on the building.

15           By limiting the forces, the number of  
16 cross-bases would be limited. Progressive  
17 collapse measures would be installed in the AIB.  
18 Seismic and blast protection would result in  
19 direct long-term major beneficial impacts. During  
20 construction, direct short-term minor adverse  
21 impacts would occur.

22           With all master plan alternatives,

1 construction, demolition, excavation and  
2 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
3 safety from the removal of asbestos and lead-based  
4 paint, which would be short-term.

5           The removal of asbestos and lead-based  
6 paint would also create long-term beneficial  
7 impacts. Additionally, as with any construction  
8 project, the potential exists for safety hazards  
9 which would adversely impact human health and  
10 safety.

11           In the long-term, security upgrades would  
12 reduce the likelihood of a campus security breach  
13 which would protect the safety of visitors and  
14 employees. Base-isolation of the Castle would  
15 limit the forces a seismic event would have on the  
16 building. Seismic and blast protection would  
17 result in direct long-term moderate beneficial  
18 impacts.

19           The construction, demolition, excavation  
20 and renovation activities would also impact air  
21 quality. Fugitive dust would be created and  
22 construction equipment would generate volatile

1 organic compounds and nitrous oxides creating  
2 short-term minor adverse impacts to air quality.

3           A new central utility plant would be  
4 constructed that would use modern energy efficient  
5 units, and the Smithsonian would no longer use GSA  
6 steam and chilled water from their central heating  
7 plant.

8           There would ultimately be direct minor  
9 long-term beneficial impacts. The improvements to  
10 the mechanical equipment would have a beneficial  
11 impact on air quality.

12           Construction equipment would emit carbon  
13 dioxide. These emissions would have short-term  
14 minor adverse impacts to greenhouse gas levels. A  
15 new central utility plant with sustainable  
16 building design would allow the Smithsonian to  
17 reduce the amount of energy needed to be purchased  
18 from the energy grid.

19           This is expected to result in a 39  
20 percent reduction in carbon dioxide. This would  
21 result in long-term indirect and direct negligible  
22 beneficial impacts.

1           The land use of the staff mocking of this  
2   would not change. The removal of the existing  
3   loading ramp next to the Freer Gallery and the  
4   reconfiguration of the Ripley Garden would create  
5   a more visible and inviting pedestrian connection  
6   between the National Mall and the Southwest  
7   Ecodistrict.

8           The elements common to all master plan  
9   alternatives would be consistent with the goals of  
10   the Southwest Ecodistrict and the National Mall  
11   plans and the guiding principles of the federal  
12   elements of the comprehensive plan for the  
13   National Capitol. This would have direct and  
14   indirect long and short-term moderate beneficial  
15   impacts by complementing other planning efforts.

16           With all the master plan alternatives,  
17   the construction, demolition, excavation and  
18   renovation would also adversely impact visitor use  
19   and experience. Temporary closures to the areas  
20   within the South Mall Campus would impact  
21   pedestrians and bicyclists affecting their ability  
22   to travel directly between memorials, monuments

1 and recreational spots within the vicinity of the  
2 South Mall Campus.

3           Relocation of exhibits would occur during  
4 construction which would disrupt the visitor  
5 experience. Upon completion of all phases of the  
6 master plan, visitorship to the South Mall Campus  
7 is expected to increase.

8           A centralized visitor center would  
9 enhance visitor orientation and underground  
10 connections to the Quadrangle Building.  
11 Circulation, wayfinding and visibility  
12 improvements within and outside the campus would  
13 be improved.

14           In addition, new educational museum and  
15 event spaces would be created, all resulting in  
16 major long-term beneficial impacts to the visitor  
17 use of the South Mall Campus and their experience.  
18 In addition, the Southwest Ecodistrict would  
19 increase visitorship resulting in indirect long-  
20 term beneficial impacts.

21           With the implementation of the master  
22 plan, there would be a complete replacement and

1 upgrade to the mechanical, electrical, water,  
2 sanitary and storm water infrastructure, and the  
3 South Mall Campus would be removed from GSA steam  
4 and chilled water.

5           The proposed changes in programming and  
6 the addition of food service would require  
7 additional utility service compared to the current  
8 condition. However, the central utility plant  
9 would provide a more efficient and reliable  
10 system.

11           Campus-wide energy efficient and  
12 sustainability measures would be implemented.  
13 This would result in reductions in energy and  
14 water supplies throughout the South Mall Campus  
15 which would lessen the burden on the utility  
16 providers in the region.

17           This would have a direct, long-term  
18 moderate beneficial impact to utilities.  
19 Indirectly, short-term minor adverse impacts would  
20 occur from the disruption of the utilities during  
21 construction.

22           Waste will be generated while

1 construction is occurring. A minimum of 50  
2 percent of the construction waste would be re-  
3 used, salvaged or recycled. The remaining would  
4 be disposed of at a local landfill.

5           The increase in construction waste  
6 results in a short-term negligible to minor direct  
7 adverse impact. Having a central loading facility  
8 would consolidate waste streams into one location,  
9 which increases the efficiency of waste handling.  
10 A central loading facility would allow for waste  
11 streams, collections, deliveries and distribution  
12 to be separated.

13           Direct long-term moderate beneficial  
14 impacts would result from streamlining the waste  
15 management of the South Mall Campus. In the long-  
16 term, the increased waste generated on the South  
17 Mall Campus would result in indirect, short and  
18 long-term negligible adverse impacts.

19           The Smithsonian would expand their  
20 composting, recycling, re-use and return to vendor  
21 programs, and 80 percent of the waste would be  
22 diverted from landfills.



1           In any of the master plan alternatives,  
2 additional vehicle trips would be generated and  
3 bicycle, pedestrian and transit trips are expected  
4 to increase resulting in direct, long-term adverse  
5 impact to the local transportation network.

6           While a new loading dock would introduce  
7 a new signal control curcut (phonetic 00:42:18),  
8 the three uncontrolled driveways would be  
9 eliminated. This would have a net benefit to  
10 overall traffic, operations and not generate new  
11 trips from delivery trucks.

12           This would result in long-term beneficial  
13 impacts to the local roadways. Connectivity  
14 enhancement would reduce pedestrian demand on  
15 adjacent sidewalks and visitor safety during  
16 construction would be accomplished through a  
17 health and safety plan, signage and fencing.  
18 There would be no direct impacts.

19           Are there any comments on the elements?

20           MS. KOSTER: So again, just a reminder,  
21 that was -- and I think a very comprehensive  
22 overview of the impacts across all of the

1 alternatives you'll now be hearing about.

2 Are there any questions that people have  
3 at this time about what Aran or Liz just shared?

4 (Pause)

5 MS. KOSTER: Yes.

6 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Steve McLaughlin  
7 (phonetic 00:43:26).

8 I think the report estimates of the  
9 impact of visual quality from wiping out the Enid  
10 A. Haupt Garden are underestimated, to say the  
11 least, across all of the alternatives.

12 I think it's somewhat disrespectful of  
13 the whole profession of the landscape  
14 architecture. I think everything is focused on  
15 views of buildings and ignores the fact that the  
16 current configuration of the Quadrangle landscape  
17 is very much an oasis for people who are  
18 Washingtonians and people who are visiting from  
19 out of town, alike.

20 And understanding there are still, you  
21 know, problems to solve in regard to circulation  
22 and wayfinding, for instance, but I think that the

1 designs that have been shown thus far for all of  
2 the alternatives do an inadequate job of storing  
3 the quality -- not reproducing the exact same  
4 design; obviously, that's not possible, but  
5 restoring the quality of the existing space as a  
6 refuge from all the open spaces where people feel  
7 very small.

8 But I think the quality is to the  
9 existing design that are worth saving. Thank you.

10 MR. COAKLEY: I think as the design team,  
11 we can say that we agree with you. I think some  
12 of the materials that you might be referencing are  
13 from Alternative D, which had more of a park-like  
14 atmosphere.

15 Since then, the design team has spent a  
16 significant effort of trying to capture the  
17 character in the intimate space of the existing  
18 Haupt Garden. And Alternative B and Alternative F  
19 are highly focused on maintaining the spirit of  
20 the current Haupt Garden, but we definitely  
21 appreciate your comments on that.

22 I think that's something that we want to

1 address as a whole to this public process is there  
2 are a lot of conceptions of what the master plan  
3 is based on the initial alternative.

4           We took those comments from the public  
5 very seriously, and we have since amended both  
6 Alternative B, which was, I would say, an  
7 alternative that looked at minimizing the above  
8 grade changes while still providing the utility,  
9 and then we've also looked at Alternative F, which  
10 again, that is something that is looking to  
11 maintain the character but give the utility, as  
12 well as the circulation and visitor services that  
13 should be expected at something like the South  
14 Mall Campus.

15           MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

16           MS. KOSTER: Mr. Tiller?

17           MR. TILLER: Pat Tiller again.

18           As long as you open that can of worms,  
19 why was it not considered by the design team to  
20 restore the design of the Haupt Garden? Why are  
21 we -- is this something we'll talk about later?  
22 Is this the appropriate time to ask that?

1           I mean, what you described is we'll  
2   restore the sense, the quality, the general  
3   feeling, which you have a very important mid-  
4   century modern landscape design there, after you  
5   do all the work, after you do the repairing of the  
6   roofs and all the stuff that needs to be done  
7   under there.

8           What was the decision that we couldn't  
9   restore the design of the landscape; the Haupt  
10  Garden? We had to go to something else?

11          MR. COAKLEY: We should say Alternative B  
12  is that exploration. So what we're trying to  
13  present is a balanced pathway of showing all of  
14  the different options that can be attained that  
15  still meet our purpose and need, and Alternative B  
16  is one of the ones that we are looking at, as well  
17  as Alternative D and Alternative F.

18          So there are options between all of these  
19  that span the spectrum that you're looking for.

20          MR. TILLER: But what you're saying is B  
21  is leaving it alone or restoring it wholly?

22          MR. COAKLEY: Well, in order to redo the

1 roof, we're going to have to remove the entire  
2 Haupt Garden, but --

3 MR. TILLER: Well, I understand that.

4 MR. COAKLEY: But the scheme is to put it  
5 back as intact as possible with its current  
6 layout.

7 MR. TILLER: But that's not the plan for  
8 F. Correct?

9 MR. COAKLEY: No. F offers a different  
10 pathway.

11 MR. TILLER: Completely different --

12 MR. COAKLEY: But F is very much focused  
13 on maintaining the character. So maybe not the  
14 exact layout, because we're trying to make some  
15 circulation changes on this, but very much the  
16 spirit of it; small intimate spaces, decorative  
17 trees, diversity of plantings, much different than  
18 the Alternative D which shows that park-like  
19 atmosphere.

20 We're not into -- that was something that  
21 we considered, but we've also wanted to address  
22 the public's concerns about that.

1           MR. TILLER: Could you expand on that a  
2 little bit?

3           (No response heard)

4           MR. TILLER: Also considering the public  
5 -- I lost the last word.

6           MR. COAKLEY: Oh, considering the  
7 public's comments.

8           So we've been trying to -- as these  
9 alternatives have developed, we are building upon  
10 that initial proposal, and then modifying our  
11 ideas to be more in line with what the public is  
12 asking.

13          MR. TILLER: Were there public comments  
14 that said we don't like the design of the Haupt  
15 Garden? We wanted something else.

16          MR. COAKLEY: In Alternative D, there are  
17 certainly comments that --

18          MR. TILLER: No, the question I'm asking  
19 is, you said you've come up with a different  
20 landscape design for D. And the reason why you  
21 did was because it's responding to public  
22 comments.

1 MR. COAKLEY: F.

2 MR. TILLER: F. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

3 I've been with this so long as you all  
4 have been, I got confused.

5 So you're saying that there were  
6 overwhelming public comments to not restore the  
7 design of the Haupt Garden; you had to come up  
8 with something else?

9 GROUP: No.

10 MR. COAKLEY: No. I think what we're  
11 trying to say is Alternative F is looking to  
12 maintain the characteristic of the Haupt Garden.

13 MR. TILLER: Why not retain the design of  
14 the Haupt Garden?

15 MR. COAKLEY: That's Alternative B.

16 MR. TILLER: I understand that. Okay.

17 (Discussion off the record)

18 MS. KOSTER: Okay?

19 And what I will note is we are going to  
20 go through those alternatives, so there will be --  
21 in just a few minutes. So that will also, I  
22 think, provide an opportunity for all of us to



1 actually see what Aran has been talking about and  
2 provide an opportunity for a little bit more  
3 exploration of that, if you want.

4 Are there any more questions or --

5 Sure. And please, if you can identify  
6 yourself.

7 MR. GAWEEETE: Hi. Omar Gaweete (phonetic  
8 `00:50:09) with DRR Group. I just had a quick  
9 question.

10 When we're going over these -- the  
11 impacts for each of the different schemes here, we  
12 refer to long-term and negligible and short-term  
13 and major and minor, and I know that this is just  
14 a qualitative analysis at this point, because we  
15 really have to dig into the details to go to the -  
16 - you know, the quantities of whatever it might  
17 be, time and money.

18 But can you give us a sense of what  
19 short-term and long-term is?

20 MS. KOSTER: Maybe that's Liz? And Liz,  
21 if you want, you can just speak right into that  
22 microphone. Just hit the button right there.

1           MS. ESTES: So short-term impacts would  
2 be during the construction period for the master  
3 plan, which would be constructed in phases. Long-  
4 term would be the impacts associated with the  
5 implementation of whatever alternative is  
6 ultimately chosen.

7           MR. GAWEETE: Thanks.

8           MS. KOSTER: Does that answer your  
9 question?

10           (No response heard)

11           MS. KOSTER: Are there any other  
12 questions at this time? Otherwise, we'll go ahead  
13 and start looking at the next alternative.

14           (No response heard)

15           MS. KOSTER: All right. I'm getting some  
16 nods. So let's go ahead and look at the next  
17 alternative.

18           MR. COAKLEY: Okay. Alternative B.

19           So Alternative B is one -- is the action  
20 alternative that looks at maintaining the above  
21 grade condition with as minimal change as  
22 possible, but providing the infrastructure utility

1 below grade to support the museum's future goals  
2 as well as their current needs.

3           So what I mean by that is this will have  
4 a centralized -- this will have the centralized  
5 loading dock. This will also involve a  
6 replacement of the Haupt Garden roof, relocation  
7 of the entries to the Sackler and African Art, as  
8 we previously discussed the Freer handicapped  
9 entrance as well as repurposing the loading  
10 entrance at the AIB, the elimination of the  
11 loading area at AIB, elimination of the Quad's  
12 loading ramp, elimination of the Ripley Pavilion  
13 to accommodate that centralized loading,  
14 restoration renovation of the Hirshhorn,  
15 restoration renovation of the Hirshhorn sculpture  
16 garden walls, and then again, the restoration of  
17 the Castle as well as a seismic retrofit.

18           And then you can also see here -- this is  
19 access stairways to the below grade visitor  
20 center. So on this scheme, you can see there's  
21 pretty significant new construction that's below  
22 grade that proposing. This is for the central

1 utility plant.

2           That plant does as much as possible to  
3 avoid excavating under the Castle. As previously  
4 stated, there will be some excavation under the  
5 West Range and Commons area of the Castle for the  
6 loading, restoration of the existing tunnel  
7 between the Hirshhorn Plaza and the sculpture  
8 garden.

9           So again, we do this check to see how it  
10 meets the purpose and need. So with the new  
11 visitor center, the expanded below grade visitor  
12 center, we do have enhanced visitor center  
13 amenities.

14           We'll have the enhanced utilities because  
15 of the below grade mechanical plant. We'll have a  
16 consolidated delivery as well as separation of  
17 loading utilities, meaning trash, recycling,  
18 collections, food services, and then also an  
19 expansion of program space.

20           What it doesn't increase is there will  
21 still be limited accessibility to the Castle. No  
22 consolidation of visitor amenities to the Quad

1 area, because there will not be as much of a  
2 connection between the new below grade visitor  
3 services and the existing Quad B-1 layout, limited  
4 improvement to below grade daylight.

5           The museum entries will still be  
6 difficult to find, because they'll still be  
7 shielded by the Castle as well as the gardens that  
8 are in front of them.

9           And then multiple points of entry to all  
10 of these various facilities, because we won't be  
11 reconfiguring what the security sequence will be.  
12 These will still be the primary entries to each  
13 museum.

14           So you can here, again, the slides  
15 showing 75 percent of the visitors from the mall.  
16 We're trying to increase the visibility of those  
17 museum entries, and that will be relocating the  
18 entries to the north side of the museum pavilions.

19           And here is a diagrammatic north-south  
20 section. You can see the expanded visitor center  
21 with a select bridging between this expanded below  
22 grade visitor center and the Quadrangle complex.

1           Again, limited daylight, because we're  
2   trying to keep the garden as is in the scheme.  
3   Also, the loading area will try to be kept as  
4   intact as possible in this location. Collections  
5   -- this is the back of house area and the museum,  
6   so it's still the mix of programs, because we're  
7   trying to maintain the museum pavilions and the  
8   circulation through those spaces without doing  
9   major structural reconfigurations.

10           So you can see, this is the proposed  
11   basement plan, new visitor center, connection to  
12   the Castle, but we have limited interface between  
13   this new visitor center and the museums proper.  
14   So one of the issues that we're coming up with is  
15   because of the Quad's existing programming, we're  
16   going to be bringing visitors through essentially,  
17   back of house spaces to the museums, so that's not  
18   an ideal flow.

19           And we also -- you can see here, we are  
20   maintaining those existing entry pavilion  
21   circulations. So we'll have security that's  
22   required at these areas as well as at this area,

1 and you'll be going through a back of house space,  
2 so you may require additional security screening  
3 before visitors can move from the visitor center  
4 to the connecting museums.

5 MS. ESTES: Impacts on cultural resources  
6 from Alternative B include the removal of the  
7 Ripley Pavilion, the new opening in the Hirshhorn  
8 Plaza walls and the minor reconfiguration of the  
9 Haupt Garden. The direct impacts would be minor  
10 and adverse.

11 Restoring the Hirshhorn tunnel would have  
12 beneficial long-term impacts. Other areas of  
13 potential impact will be further evaluated at the  
14 time of project design.

15 Visual resources for Alternative B will  
16 be impacted by the opening of the Hirshhorn Plaza  
17 Wall and tunnel opening, and the reconfiguration  
18 of the Quadrangle Building and Haupt Garden. This  
19 would result in minor to moderate adverse and  
20 minor beneficial impacts.

21 Alternative B would have the smallest  
22 amount of excavation. Excavation under the

1 Castile would be limited to the west wing for  
2 seismic isolation, the visitor center, central  
3 utility plant and a new central loading dock.

4 Under Alternative B, no changes to the  
5 sculpture garden would occur in addition to the  
6 impacts from the actions common to all  
7 alternatives.

8 Alternative B would require more  
9 underpinning for the AIB compared to Alternative B  
10 -- D, excuse me, but minimizes excavation of the  
11 entire campus when compared to Alternative D.  
12 Alternative B would result in short-term and long-  
13 term moderate adverse impacts.

14 In addition to the impacts from the  
15 actions common to all alternatives, there would be  
16 a minimal -- there would be minimal consistency  
17 with the comprehensive plan goal of a pedestrian  
18 oriented development that adds vitality and visual  
19 interest to urban areas, and minimal consistency  
20 with the Southwest Ecodistrict goals for improved  
21 connections to open space.

22 It would be consistent with the



1 comprehensive plans and goals for preserving,  
2 protecting and rehabilitating historic properties,  
3 and would restore and renovate historic buildings  
4 and minimize changes to above ground spaces  
5 consistent with the National Mall plans and  
6 cultural resource goals.

7           Additional program space and visitor  
8 amenities are consistent with the National Mall  
9 plan's goal for civic stage and portions of  
10 visitor experience, but the lack of visibility of  
11 museum entrances and the lack of consolidated  
12 amenities is not keeping with the National Mall  
13 plan's goal for improved access and circulation  
14 and improved visitor experience. These result in  
15 minor to moderate long-term adverse and beneficial  
16 impacts.

17           There would be temporary impacts to  
18 visitor use and experience from construction.  
19 Temporary closures to areas within the South Mall  
20 Campus would impact pedestrians and bicyclists  
21 affecting their ability to travel between  
22 memorials, monuments and recreational spots.

1           The master plan would be completed in  
2 phases to minimize these disturbances. The  
3 overall visitor experience would be improved after  
4 the implementation of the master plan.

5           A small opening in the Hirshhorn's West  
6 Plaza wall would enhance circulation and restoring  
7 the tunnel would allow visitors to access the  
8 sculpture garden and museum more easily.

9           The removal of the Ripley Pavilion would  
10 better connect the visitor center and the  
11 Quadrangle Building. The relocation of African  
12 Art and Sackler entrances to the north would re-  
13 orient the museums with the Quadrangle Building,  
14 but underground museum spaces would continue to be  
15 hidden from the National Mall resulting in  
16 moderate long-term adverse impacts.

17           As with the impacts from the elements  
18 common to all master plan alternatives, the  
19 construction, demolition, excavation and  
20 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
21 safety from the removal of the asbestos and lead-  
22 based paint, which would be short-term.

1           However, removal of asbestos and lead-  
2   based paint would also have long-term beneficial  
3   impacts. Alternative B would not provide adequate  
4   daylight for staff, because there would be no  
5   skylights in the design for the Quadrangle  
6   Building and there would be less room for security  
7   improvements resulting in minor and adverse long-  
8   term impacts.

9           Are there comments on Alternative B?

10           (No response heard)

11           MS. KOSTER: All right. So we're on  
12   Alternative B. Are there any clarifying questions  
13   so that you're clear on what Alternative B and its  
14   impacts might be? Steve?

15           SPEAKER: Not so much a question as a  
16   comment. I think that the analysis of this  
17   alternative, making it continually difficult for  
18   visitors on the mall to find the museums shows a  
19   lack of imagination regarding wayfinding.

20           I think that there could be design  
21   solutions that drew people back there by placement  
22   of objects out -- you know, near the east and

1 west ends of the Castle, and then sort of a trail  
2 of breadcrumbs, so to speak, in terms of you know,  
3 objects that just draw you back there.

4 That's my comment.

5 MS. KOSTER: Thank you. Other comments  
6 at this time or questions?

7 SPEAKER: I would just say that's a great  
8 idea.

9 MS. KOSTER: Okay.

10 SPEAKER: I think that's a great idea.

11 MS. KOSTER: That's good. I think we've  
12 got that. Thank you. Is there anything else?

13 Okay. Let's move on to the next  
14 alternative.

15 MR. COAKLEY: So Alternative D -- this is  
16 the alternative that everyone is probably most  
17 familiar with. This was our initial master plan  
18 alternative.

19 The general description of it would be  
20 that it introduces these relocated museum  
21 pavilions closer to the mall to increase  
22 visibility of those quadrangle museums. It also

1 looks at organizing the circulation to have better  
2 flow east-west through the campus.

3           It introduces the loading dock as well as  
4 the centralized mechanical plant. This scheme  
5 also was looking at changing the Hirshhorn plaza  
6 area to make it less fenced-in from the mall,  
7 increasing its connection there.

8           I'll go into diagrams showing exactly  
9 which elements we're talking about. Again,  
10 loading dock, the Freer, the AIB entry conditions,  
11 the removal of the Ripley to accommodate the  
12 loading area.

13           You can see here this is the removal of  
14 the pavilions and relocating them as well as  
15 reducing their size to -- closer to the mall to  
16 increase the visual tie from the museum as it  
17 relates to the mall as well as a restoration of --  
18 a restoration and renovation of the Hirshhorn  
19 sculpture garden. Here you can see the proposed  
20 removal of the Hirshhorn plaza walls.

21           Below grade -- this is where -- probably  
22 one of the more distinguishing features of this.

1 Rather than occupying the un-excavation space  
2 between AIB and the Quad -- that's what was  
3 proposed in Alternative B for the mechanical --  
4 the centralized mechanical plant, this scheme was  
5 proposing to put the centralized mechanical plant  
6 underneath the Castle building itself.

7           So that's why there is extensive  
8 excavation in this area. And from here, this is  
9 the utility tunnel connecting to the Hirshhorn  
10 building, and this is a proposed below grade  
11 sculpture gallery at the Hirshhorn sculpture  
12 plaza, as well as an enlarged connection between  
13 that below grade sculpture gallery to the  
14 Hirshhorn B-1 level.

15           So again, we evaluate this based on the  
16 purpose and need. Improved ABA accessibility,  
17 enhanced visitor center amenities -- that's that  
18 below grade visitor center that we were talking  
19 about, improved campus circulation and wayfinding  
20 -- the relocated pavilions, additional program  
21 space, the consolidated delivery, improved below  
22 grade daylight so these skylight zones around here

1 allow greater daylight into the below grade  
2 museums, the enhancement to the utilities.

3           Now where the scheme was not measuring up  
4 to some of the public comments was the large  
5 amount of excavation that was required under the  
6 Castle. This would have required -- or this  
7 scheme requires an extensive amount of excavation  
8 under the Castle to accommodate the loading dock  
9 as well as the central utility plant.

10           Removal of the Renwick Gates -- we've  
11 heard from the public that the Renwick Gates are  
12 something that are looking to be preserved. The  
13 garden lacks intimate space. This was more of a  
14 park-like atmosphere rather than a garden  
15 atmosphere.

16           And then because we were trying to  
17 accommodate a landscape grade slope to bring  
18 people to the below grade visitor center, we were  
19 sloping the surface down, which changed the  
20 traditional relationship of the Castle to its  
21 (inaudible 01:07:07). You know, it's been a level  
22 relationship since the Castle was built.

1           This was introducing an at-grade change.  
2   So you can see again, the diagrammatic view of  
3   this.

4           But what this scheme did offer was much  
5   improved connections between the education and the  
6   visitor center as well as to the museums and event  
7   spaces. So you can see that the collection spaces  
8   have then been relocated to areas that do not  
9   require as much daylight.

10          Sensitive museum displayed spaces are  
11   also relocated to areas that have much more  
12   protected from daylight conditions. Office  
13   spaces, consolidated.

14          A central event space that can act as a  
15   pan-institutional gathering space that each of the  
16   museums can use or just the greater Smithsonian  
17   units can use that will introduce greater variety  
18   to the programs that can be hosted by the  
19   Quadrangle Building, as well as bringing in after-  
20   hours events. So you could have public speaking  
21   events, plays, various performances that could  
22   place in this event space.



1           And then again, also, we're introducing  
2 much better daylight to the education spaces as  
3 well as the visitor center.

4           MS. ESTES: The impacts to cultural  
5 resources in Alternative B are the greatest of  
6 those across all of the alternatives. The  
7 undertaking will create major adverse impacts on  
8 the Hirshhorn Museum and sculpture garden, the  
9 National Mall, the Smithsonian Quadrangle and the  
10 Castle.

11           Similarly, impacts on visual resources  
12 are greatest under Alternative D, primarily  
13 resulting from changes to the Hirshhorn Museum and  
14 sculpture garden, the visitor center entrance to  
15 the Castle and the reconfiguration of the  
16 Quadrangle Building and the Haupt Garden resulting  
17 in minor to major adverse impacts to visual  
18 resources.

19           Alternative D has the largest amount of  
20 excavation. Excavation under the entire footprint  
21 of the Castle for seismic isolation, the central  
22 utility plant, the loading facility and the

1 visitor center would occur.

2           In addition, excavation under Jefferson  
3 Drive would occur from expanding the tunnel  
4 connection to the Hirshhorn sculpture garden.  
5 Alternative D would have short and long-term major  
6 adverse impacts to soils previously disturbed.

7           With Alternative D, the connection to the  
8 Southwest Ecodistrict is strengthened, and this  
9 alternative would increase views to the gardens  
10 and the Castle from outside, and is consistent  
11 with the Southwest Ecodistrict's goals for  
12 pedestrian oriented development and improved  
13 connections to public space.

14           Alternative D would also eliminate the  
15 greatest number of physical and visual barriers  
16 between the National Mall, the South Mall Campus  
17 and the Southwest Ecodistrict promoting the goals  
18 of the comprehensive plan in the Southwest  
19 Ecodistrict.

20           However, it is not fully consistent with  
21 the urban design or historic preservation elements  
22 of the comprehensive plan. Alternative D also

1 includes program space and improves visibility of  
2 museum entrances consistent with the National Mall  
3 plan's goals for improved visitor experience and  
4 improved access.

5           There would be temporary impacts to  
6 visitor use and experience from construction.  
7 Temporary closures to areas within the South Mall  
8 Campus would impact pedestrians and bicyclists,  
9 affecting their ability to travel directly between  
10 memorials, monuments and recreational spots.

11           The master plan would be completed in  
12 phases to minimize these impacts. Once complete,  
13 the overall visitor experience would be improved.  
14 The Hirshhorn plaza walls would be removed which  
15 would enhance circulation.

16           The tunnel would be opened and expanded  
17 allowing visitors to access the sculpture garden  
18 and the museum more easily. New below grade  
19 galleries would provide space for large  
20 exhibitions.

21           The removal of the Ripley, African Art  
22 and Sackler pavilions would better connect the

1 visitor center with the Quadrangle Building and  
2 provide better visibility to the National Mall.  
3 The Haupt Garden would be expanded to improve  
4 circulation and to provide day lighting. These  
5 changes would provide moderate long-term  
6 beneficial impacts to visitor use and experience.

7           As with the impacts from elements common  
8 to all master plan alternatives, construction,  
9 demolition, excavation and renovation would  
10 adversely impact human health and safety.

11           The removal of asbestos and lead-based  
12 paint would also have a long-term benefit --  
13 beneficial impact. Alternative D would provide  
14 adequate daylight for staff and has the advantage  
15 of consolidating entry locations throughout the  
16 South Mall Campus, thereby having the potential  
17 for increased security resulting in direct long-  
18 term moderate beneficial impacts.

19           Comments on Alternative D?

20           (No response heard)

21           MS. KOSTER: Okay. There's Alternative  
22 D. And I'll check to see if anyone either first

1 has any clarifying questions. And if you want to  
2 talk, Joanne, we'll get you a microphone, because  
3 this is being recorded.

4 (Discussion off the record)

5 SPEAKER: It may not be relevant, but I'm  
6 wondering --

7 MS. KOSTER: Joanne, could you identify  
8 yourself?

9 SPEAKER: Excuse me?

10 MS. KOSTER: Could you just say who you  
11 are.

12 MS. NEWHOUSE: I can't -- can you --

13 MS. KOSTER: Can you identify yourself?

14 MS. NEWHOUSE: Thank you.

15 MS. KOSTER: Thanks.

16 MS. NEWHOUSE: My name is -- you said my  
17 name, so I thought I was identified (Laughter).  
18 Sorry. Joanne Newhouse.

19 MS. KOSTER: Thanks.

20 MS. NEWHOUSE: I'm executive director of  
21 the Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association. Some  
22 of the Smithsonian museums are members of this

1 association.

2 I did have just a question, which is, is  
3 there an alternative -- I haven't seen it, so I'm  
4 going to think the answer is no, but I don't know  
5 if it's possible that some of the better features  
6 of Alternative D that are below grade can be  
7 incorporated in another alternative that might be  
8 better received up -- at grade.

9 You've done some moving around and you've  
10 added some different things here that you don't  
11 have on other things. But I'm sort of wondering  
12 why they may not be able to be included in some  
13 fashion, maybe quite a different location or  
14 something in some of the other alternatives.

15 MR. COAKLEY: So Alternative B, that's  
16 been modified significantly --

17 MS. NEWHOUSE: Right.

18 MR. COAKLEY: -- the first time we  
19 introduced that.

20 And what's changed is we have introduced  
21 the central plant as well as the loading and  
22 visitor to Alternative B to give it those

1 practical functions that are required.

2 But some of the circulation issues that  
3 are inherent in the existing garden are not  
4 resolved in Alternative B.

5 MS. NEWHOUSE: It wasn't the circulation  
6 that I was thinking of when I saw that. With some  
7 of the facilities that you provided below grade  
8 and talked about as in theatre and performance and  
9 meeting space, that didn't seem to be part of B.

10 MR. COAKLEY: That will be addressed in  
11 Alternative F. That is --

12 MS. NEWHOUSE: But then you lose other  
13 things in F, I think.

14 I mean, in other words, is there any  
15 alternative that -- I didn't see an alternative  
16 that sort of incorporates some of the best  
17 features, and it may be not possible, and that's  
18 what I'm asking, below grade to --

19 MR. COAKLEY: So in other words --

20 MS. NEWHOUSE: -- keep the best at grade.

21 MS. TROWBRIDGE: I think I would say,  
22 Joanne, that the underground -- it's difficult to

1 reconfigure the Quadrangle Building underground if  
2 you leave its entry pavilions with it -- the cores  
3 for public circulation which is where you need  
4 your galleries, at the south end of the Quadrangle  
5 Building --

6 MS. NEWHOUSE: Right.

7 MS. TROWBRIDGE: -- on all levels.

8 What we really need to do is to move  
9 their entrances --

10 MS. NEWHOUSE: I understand that. Yes.

11 MS. TROWBRIDGE: -- and their cores, so  
12 that we can really reconfigure the entire Quad.

13 MS. NEWHOUSE: Maybe I missed something.  
14 Are there spaces below grade, like the performance  
15 space in B, which I may have missed hearing you  
16 say?

17 MR. COAKLEY: No. B does not have that,  
18 but F has that. F is --

19 MS. NEWHOUSE: But F has more changes at  
20 grade, too.

21 MR. COAKLEY: Those changes at grade are  
22 to facilitate the below grade work.



1 MS. NEWHOUSE: Got it.

2 Okay. So then it's not possible, is the  
3 answer.

4 MR. COAKLEY: It -- it is -- it is not  
5 possible.

6 MS. NEWHOUSE: Thank you.

7 MR. COAKLEY: And in order to make the  
8 circulation, the security and the enlarged spaces  
9 that would become great --

10 MS. NEWHOUSE: I was just trying to  
11 figure out if it's --

12 MR. COAKLEY: Yep.

13 MS. NEWHOUSE: -- if there was some way  
14 to do everything (Laughter). There never seems to  
15 be.

16 MS. KOSTER: Okay. Yes., Another  
17 question here.

18 SPEAKER: I was going to ask a question  
19 very similar to Joanne's -- why, for instance,  
20 Alternative B couldn't have the same improvements  
21 to universal accessibility at the Castle. And  
22 that was one of the red boxes on that scheme

1 saying failed to improve accessibility at the  
2 Castle.

3 Why can that feature of Alternative D not  
4 be part of B?

5 MR. COAKLEY: So one of the issues with  
6 that is that note should have --

7 MS. KOSTER: I was going to say, can we  
8 get to that alternative so we can see it visually?

9 MR. COAKLEY: There.

10 One of the items, it's limited  
11 accessibility throughout the campus. At the  
12 Castle, it could be improved, but the existing  
13 pavilions --

14 SPEAKER: Gotcha.

15 MR. COAKLEY: -- it will be more  
16 illuminated. That's all.

17 SPEAKER: Okay.

18 MR. COAKLEY: So it's a more general  
19 note. I could have easily have just put the note  
20 down at --

21 SPEAKER: Right. The arrow threw me,  
22 because it was pointing at the Castle.

1 MR. COAKLEY: Yeah.

2 SPEAKER: And I have another question  
3 regarding skylights. Getting light to the below  
4 grade facilities, is it necessary to have  
5 humongous skylights, or can it be done through  
6 other ways like fiber optic light tubes and  
7 lenses, and even incorporating the strands of the  
8 fiber optics into some sort of art feature above  
9 grade if -- you know, who knows?

10 MR. COAKLEY: You know, certainly through  
11 solar tubes, you could increase the illumination,  
12 but it's not the same as being able to see a sky.

13 SPEAKER: True.

14 MS. KOSTER: Thank you. Thank you. Are  
15 there any other questions?

16 (No response heard)

17 MS. KOSTER: All right, I'm looking  
18 around. I think we're ready to hear the last --

19 MR. COAKLEY: Alternative F.

20 MS. KOSTER: -- Alternative F.

21 MR. COAKLEY: So Alternative F was  
22 responsive to a lot of the public comments that

1 we've gotten. You can see that we are looking to  
2 maintain the character of the garden.

3           So even though we are relocating the  
4 museum pavilions for greater security as well as  
5 improved circulation, we are very much looking to  
6 keep this as a space with trees, intimate spaces,  
7 gathering spaces, a central parterre -- all of the  
8 elements that we have.

9           We are also very excited about the idea  
10 of connecting to the Southwest Ecodistrict with  
11 the Haupt Garden now being at the head of that  
12 condition. So you know, what a great idea that  
13 the Haupt Garden mediates the connection of the  
14 Mall and then of the waterfront. So we think  
15 that's a very exciting feature that is potentially  
16 available with this configuration.

17           The other item that we wanted to address  
18 was keeping grade level in front of the Castle.  
19 So no longer that dip that was seen in Alternative  
20 D. We are now trying to keep the level parterre.

21           So I'll go through, again, the particular  
22 elements of it. Loading, relocation of those

1 pavilions, restoration and renovation of the  
2 Hirshhorn sculpture garden, renovation of the  
3 Castle, removal of the loading facilities that are  
4 no longer being used, and again, the east-west  
5 circulation, all the while maintaining the  
6 characteristics of the Haupt Garden.

7           Below grade. This is where you see some  
8 very significant changes with Alternative D. In  
9 this scheme, we're really trying to limit the  
10 amount of excavation underneath the Castle.

11           So beneath the Castle, 50 percent less  
12 excavation than in Alternative D, and throughout  
13 the campus as a whole, 20 percent less excavation  
14 than Alternative D.

15           We're able to do the less amount of  
16 excavation because we've relocated what was the  
17 central utility plant under Alternative D to a  
18 space in between AIB and the Castle. Now, it will  
19 require some underpinning of the AIB's wall, but  
20 we think that is a more reasonable undertaking  
21 than the excavation and underpinning that would be  
22 required under the Castle.

1           This is, again, a utility connection to  
2   the Hirshhorn in order to bring it into the  
3   central plant services.

4           So again, quick review of how the purpose  
5   and need is met: Minimize the amount of  
6   excavation below the Castle, ADA accessible.  
7   These new entries would have elevators that take  
8   people down to the visitor centers as well as the  
9   museums.

10           Enhanced visitor amenities. So that  
11   again, is the below grade visitor centers.  
12   Improve campus circulation, so visitors from the  
13   Mall side will be able to see these museum  
14   pavilions.

15           Additional programming space. This is  
16   that central event space. Consolidated loading,  
17   level grade in front of the Castle, gardens with  
18   intimate spaces and then enhanced utilities with  
19   that central utility plant and improved daylight  
20   with skylights as well as circulation stairs  
21   acting as light wells.

22           And you can also see on this scheme that

1 we are retaining as much as possible, the  
2 Hirshhorn walls. The Hirshhorn was determined to  
3 be eligible for the National Register, and in this  
4 scheme, we are looking to maintain the Hirshhorn  
5 Plaza's excellent configuration.

6           So as you can see here, the level  
7 condition from Independence to the Castle. A  
8 garden with its diversity of trees as well as the  
9 parterre. Access stairs that also provide  
10 daylight into the visitor center. Education being  
11 unified with the visitor center, so it's easy to  
12 find that.

13           The ability to consolidate visitor  
14 screening, so when visitors come down here,  
15 they'll go through a central screening location  
16 that will allow them access to all of the museums  
17 without having to be rescreened.

18           This common events space. By  
19 reconfiguring the structure in this area, we are  
20 able to provide a large gathering space that would  
21 be a great amenity for the South Campus. Again,  
22 light sensitive spaces move to locations that

1 don't receive much daylight. Collections being  
2 moved close to the loading areas, so we can have a  
3 more holistic organization of program spaces.

4           And this is a B-1 level looking at the  
5 Castle as well as the expanded visitor services.  
6 This is that access stair where visitors will be  
7 able to enter, go through a central screening  
8 location and then circulate to both museums  
9 without having to be rescreened.

10           MS. ESTES: So the impacts on cultural  
11 resources in Alternative F are similar to those  
12 described in Alternative B. However, it's  
13 important to emphasize the impacts on the National  
14 Mall, the Quadrangle, the Haupt Garden, the  
15 Hirshhorn Museum and sculpture garden have been  
16 minimized by reducing the degree of intervention.  
17 This would will result, though, in a minor to  
18 major long-term adverse impact.

19           Impacts on visual resources in  
20 Alternative F include those on the Quadrangle, the  
21 8th and 10th Street view sheds, the Hirshhorn  
22 sculpture garden and the National Mall.



1           Those on the Haupt Garden and the  
2   Hirshhorn Museum have been minimized by reducing  
3   the degree of intervention. This would also have  
4   to minor moderate adverse impacts, but there would  
5   also be beneficial impacts, as well.

6           With Alternative F, there would be a  
7   moderate amount of excavation -- excavation under  
8   the Castle for seismic isolation and the central  
9   utility plant, the loading facility and the  
10   visitor's center would be the same as Alternative  
11   B.

12           However, as with Alternative D, there  
13   would be some excavation under Jefferson Drive for  
14   expanding the tunnel connection to the Hirshhorn  
15   sculpture garden similar to -- to the sculpture  
16   garden (sic).

17           Similar to Alternative B, Alternative F  
18   would require more excavation and underpinning for  
19   the AIB compared to Alternative D. However, it  
20   minimizes excavation underneath the Castle.  
21   Impacts would be the same as Alternative B, which  
22   would result in short and long-term moderate

1 adverse impacts.

2           Like Alternative F, Alternative F  
3 strengthens the connection to the Southwest  
4 Ecodistrict and increases views to the gardens and  
5 the Castle from outside the South Mall Campus,  
6 which is consistent of the goals the Southwest  
7 Ecodistrict and comprehensive plan for a  
8 pedestrian oriented development and improved  
9 connections to public space.

10           Alternative F is more consistent with  
11 urban design and historic preservation elements of  
12 the comprehensive plan and is consistent with the  
13 National Mall plan.

14           As with Alternative B and D, there would  
15 be temporary impacts to visitor use and experience  
16 from construction. The master plan would be  
17 completed in phases to minimize these  
18 disturbances. Once completed, the overall  
19 experience would be improved and visitorship would  
20 be increased.

21           Like Alternative B, a small opening in  
22 the Hirshhorn's west plaza wall would enhance

1 circulation. The tunnel would be opened and  
2 expanded allowing visitors to access the sculpture  
3 garden and the museum more easily.

4           Like Alternative D, new below grade  
5 galleries would provide space for large exhibits  
6 at the sculpture garden. And like Alternative D,  
7 the removal of the Ripley, African Art, Sackler  
8 Pavilions would provide -- would better connect  
9 the visitor center and the Quadrangle Building and  
10 provide better visibility to the National Mall.

11           The Haupt Garden would retain its grade  
12 and the parterre would be kept. It would be  
13 expanded to improve circulation and to provide day  
14 lighting. The garden would also incorporate  
15 intimate and teaching gardens. These changes  
16 would provide major long-term beneficial impacts  
17 to visitor use and experience.

18           The impacts to human health and safety  
19 are the same as those for Alternative D.  
20 Construction, demolition, excavation and  
21 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
22 safety from the removal of lead-based paint and

1 asbestos.

2           Alternative F would provide adequate  
3 daylight for staff and has the advantage of  
4 consolidating entry locations throughout the South  
5 Mall Campus, thereby having the potential for  
6 increased security resulting in direct long-term  
7 moderate beneficial impacts.

8           And here is the impact summary for  
9 Alternative F.

10           (Pause)

11           MS. ESTES: I'm going to touch briefly on  
12 the cumulative impacts, which cumulative impacts  
13 are the incremental impact of the alternatives  
14 when you combine them with other past, present and  
15 future projects.

16           Would the no action alternative in  
17 combination with other past, present and future  
18 projects contribute to the overall adverse  
19 cumulative impacts to cultural resources from the  
20 lack of a coordinated approach to production,  
21 maintenance and stability of cultural resources?

22           In all the master plan alternatives, the

1 degree of change proposed for cultural resources  
2 of the South Mall Campus in combination with past,  
3 present and foreseeable future projects would have  
4 major adverse cumulative impacts.

5           With Alternative B, in addition to those  
6 actions previously mentioned, changes to the  
7 Quadrangle Building and the Haupt Garden would  
8 contribute to an overall moderate adverse  
9 cumulative impact.

10           The cumulative impacts associated with  
11 Alternative D would be similar to those discussed  
12 under Alternative B. However, they would be more  
13 intensified due to the grade of degree of change  
14 to the overall site and change in grade.

15           Similarly, cumulative impacts associated  
16 with Alternative F would be similar to those of  
17 Alternative B, but more intensified due to the  
18 degree of change to the overall site. However,  
19 this impact would be slightly less than  
20 Alternative B, because Alternative F maintains the  
21 existing plane of the Quadrangle and the Haupt  
22 Garden.

1           The lack of a coordinated approach to the  
2 protection, maintenance and stabilization of  
3 cultural resources under the no action alternative  
4 in coordination with other past and present and  
5 future projects would result in long-term adverse  
6 impacts -- cumulative impacts to views and vistas  
7 surrounding the South Mall Campus.

8           Past, present and future projects would  
9 change the views and vistas. The master plan  
10 alternatives would contribute to the long-term  
11 adverse impacts to these views and vistas. The  
12 greater degree of change would be more intensified  
13 under Alternatives D and F. The altering of the  
14 existing grades of the Haupt Garden and sculpture  
15 garden under Alternative D and F would create an  
16 overall moderate long-term adverse cumulative  
17 impact to these resources.

18           The South Mall Campus could potentially  
19 contribute to the short-term indirect adverse  
20 cumulative impacts to soils due to the increased  
21 soil erosion during construction.

22           Because the District of Columbia is

1 already an intensely developed urban area, the  
2 overall long-term adverse cumulative impacts would  
3 be negligible. The impacts of the proposed  
4 seismic improvements would be localized to the  
5 South Mall Campus, therefore, no cumulative  
6 impacts would result.

7           The South Mall Campus master plan would  
8 potentially contribute to short-term indirect  
9 adverse cumulative impacts to storm water due to  
10 increased soil erosion during construction  
11 activities in the area.

12           The South Mall Campus would contribute to  
13 the indirect long-term major beneficial impacts to  
14 storm water in the district by retaining storm  
15 water on-site to the maximum extent practical.

16           Construction of present and future  
17 development projects near the South Mall Campus  
18 would generate fugitive dust and emissions from  
19 construction activities and equipment resulting  
20 cumulative short-term adverse impacts to air  
21 quality.

22           The installation of gradual replacement

1 of mechanical systems with new, efficient units in  
2 existing buildings would reduce the potential  
3 effect new sources of emissions would have on air  
4 quality, resulting in long-term beneficial  
5 cumulative impact.

6           The South Mall Campus in combination with  
7 other plans will result in long-term beneficial  
8 impacts as buildings and facilities are upgraded  
9 by decreasing -- sorry.

10           Construction of present and future  
11 projects would cause an increase in traffic on the  
12 local roadway network. The master plan in  
13 combination with these projects would add slightly  
14 to the overall adverse cumulative impact.

15           The South Mall Campus master plan in  
16 combination with other plans will result in long-  
17 term beneficial cumulative impacts as buildings  
18 and facilities are upgraded by decreasing the  
19 amount of energy used and improving the way energy  
20 is produced, thereby decreasing their contribution  
21 to localized emissions.

22           By enhancing walkability, removing



1 physical and visual barriers and extending the  
2 civic qualities of the National Mall to the south,  
3 the South Mall Campus master plan would contribute  
4 to the goals common with other planning efforts in  
5 the area resulting in moderate long-term  
6 beneficial cumulative impacts.

7           The various phases of the master plan  
8 would effect the human health and safety of the  
9 South Mall Campus. Construction of present and  
10 future projects could occur at the same time  
11 resulting in short-term adverse cumulative  
12 impacts.

13           The overall cumulative impact of past,  
14 present and future planning efforts and projects  
15 in the area would be long-term and beneficial to  
16 human health and safety.

17           The various phases of the master plan  
18 could disrupt utilities of neighboring properties  
19 of the South Mall Campus. Construction of present  
20 and future projects could occur at the same time  
21 resulting in short-term adverse cumulative  
22 impacts.

1           All of these projects and planning  
2 efforts in combination with the master plan would  
3 ultimately reduce the demand for energy and water  
4 supplies and lessen the burden on utility  
5 providers in the region resulting in beneficial  
6 cumulative impacts to utilities.

7           The construction waste generated under  
8 the master plan alternative would contribute to  
9 the short-term and long-term adverse cumulative  
10 impacts of construction waste, but the additional  
11 impacts would be negligible compared to the  
12 overall volume of waste generated in the D.C.  
13 area.

14           The overall cumulative impacts to waste  
15 management from present and future actions would  
16 be long-term and beneficial. The South Mall  
17 Campus would contribute to these long-term  
18 beneficial cumulative impacts.

19           And then any comments on Alternative F or  
20 the cumulative impacts?

21           (No response heard)

22           MS. KOSTER: Okay. And I forgot to

1 mention, there was the bonus of the cumulative  
2 impacts, not just Alternative F. So with that --

3 SPEAKER: Thank you.

4 MS. KOSTER: Please, go ahead.

5 SPEAKER: I think that the report focuses  
6 on the benefit to the visual connection between  
7 Southwest D.C. and the Castle -- you know, for  
8 people who are standing on the south side of  
9 Independence Avenue, it removes both the existing  
10 entrance pavilions for the museums, improves the  
11 view of the Castle, but it ignores the fact that  
12 if you're standing at the Renwick Gate, your tone  
13 of vision as it exists now that encompasses the  
14 Castle is not obstructed by buildings.

15 There are trees, though. And moving  
16 those entrances closer to the Castle might have an  
17 impact in that way.

18 MR. COAKLEY: So that's a great comment.  
19 That was one of the items -- here, let me go back.

20 (Pause)

21 MR. COAKLEY: So one of the items that  
22 we're interested in looking at is reducing the

1 size of those museum pavilions, because we are  
2 trying to have the museum pavilions as an entry  
3 location, not as an exhibition area. The  
4 exhibition area should be below grade.

5           In our location and sizing of them, our  
6 goal is that from Independence, you'll be able to  
7 re-establish that visual connection to the Mall,  
8 so you'll be able to see the trees on either side  
9 of that, so you understand that you can get to the  
10 Mall through the Haupt Garden.

11           And then we are also, by moving them  
12 closer to the Castle, it seems counter-intuitive,  
13 but when you're standing at the Renwick Gates,  
14 there will then be less of the Castle blocked,  
15 because they are not so far in your foreground.  
16 Currently, you can't see the east (inaudible  
17 01:36:25) ranges of the Castle. So that's one of  
18 the things --

19           SPEAKER: I was mistaken (Laughter).

20           MR. COAKLEY: So that's one of the things  
21 that we're quite excited about by this relocation  
22 is that not only will you get a view of the Mall

1 from Independence, but you'll then get an expanded  
2 view of the Castle, which currently is a bit  
3 blocked by the existing location of the museum  
4 pavilions.

5           Now ideally, there would be no blockage  
6 of it, but you need to provide some entry  
7 location.

8           SPEAKER: And one other related topic is  
9 respecting the east-west access through the Arts  
10 and Industries Building.

11           MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

12           SPEAKER: And I don't see that really --

13           MR. COAKLEY: In the scheme --

14           SPEAKER: -- highlighted in this one.

15 Oh, sorry. Let's see if I can --

16           (Pause)

17           MR. COAKLEY: Here, I'll just walk us  
18 through it there.

19           So again, we are going to be putting the  
20 accessible entry at the Freer, and then you allow  
21 circulation in two directions. There as well as  
22 through these more intimate paths.

1           SPEAKER: I was thinking of visual access

2    --

3           MR. COAKLEY: Oh, a visual access.

4           SPEAKER: -- to that door.

5           MR. COAKLEY: You'll be able to see  
6 across the parterre. Actually, we do have in  
7 progress views that show this. It's not part of  
8 this presentation, because it's more a visioning  
9 exercise, but I think those will come about at the  
10 next NCPC hearing.

11           You'll see some of these character views  
12 that we're trying to establish. But you can see  
13 across that. It's not such a dense planting that  
14 the AIB's completely obscured. But again, a good  
15 comment about that.

16           SPEAKER: Thank you.

17           MS. KOSTER: Mr. Tiller?

18           MR. TILLER: Just a couple of points of  
19 confirmation. I have one question.

20           MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm?

21           MR. TILLER: In Alternative F, the  
22 Hirshhorn plaza walls are largely kept --

1           MR. COAKLEY: Intact, yes.

2           MR. TILLER: -- intact, except the one  
3 cut through the access. Good.

4           MR. COAKLEY: Yep.

5           MR. TILLER: And I can't tell from this  
6 or that, are the Renwick Gates kept in F, also?

7           MR. COAKLEY: Absolutely.

8           MR. TILLER: They're back in. Okay,  
9 good.

10          MR. COAKLEY: Because we're trying to  
11 establish -- one of the things that F is trying to  
12 address is keeping the intactness of the  
13 Quadrangle, and we feel the Hirshhorn -- I'm  
14 sorry, the Renwick Gates do an excellent job of  
15 maintaining the edge of what the Quadrangle is.

16          MR. TILLER: Okay.

17          Now a question.

18          MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm?

19          MR. TILLER: Let me try the one I didn't  
20 succeed at last time.

21          Why did you all not try to approximate or  
22 try to salvage some of the Lester Collins Haupt

1 Garden design in F?

2 MR. COAKLEY: Well, we're -- we're --  
3 again, we were trying to maintain characteristics  
4 of it, not the exact layout.

5 So we have the parterre. We have these  
6 potentially museum-centric gardens as well in the  
7 foreground. So we are maintaining the elements,  
8 but we are going more for the character as opposed  
9 to the exact layout.

10 MR. TILLER: Let me try again.

11 Why did you reject as much as you could,  
12 the exact layout? And Mrs. Haupt's niece at the  
13 landmark's hearing in Washington, D.C. for the  
14 nomination for the Quad, left the door open to  
15 this.

16 She says my aunt recognized and I  
17 recognized the landscapes are dynamic and they  
18 change and they grow and they deteriorate.

19 MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

20 MR. TILLER: And she -- Alexandra largely  
21 left the door open to say okay, we understand  
22 you've got to dig all that up. You've got leaking



1 roofs, but generally, putting back as much of the  
2 design as you can.

3           And I'm still not under -- I still don't  
4 understand why we're doing something reminiscent  
5 or evocative of why can't -- why did you decide to  
6 not recreate as much as you could of the Lester  
7 Collins design? I just don't understand.

8           Maybe I'm slow. I just don't understand  
9 what the problem was with the Collins design.

10           MR. COAKLEY: Well, I --

11           MR. TILLER: Other than the fact that  
12 this is new and evocative and sweet and intimate.  
13 That's not what I'm asking.

14           MR. COAKLEY: I think what we're trying  
15 to show is maintaining character, and that's  
16 something that's important in the master plan.  
17 But the exact design of this is many years out, so  
18 it's tough for us to -- what we're committing to  
19 is maintaining character in the experience of the  
20 space.

21           But the exact layout? I can't comment on  
22 this at this point, because we really don't know.

1 It's just in the master plan.

2 (Simultaneous discussion)

3 MR. TILLER: You don't know why you  
4 didn't?

5 MR. COAKLEY: No, but it's --

6 MS. TROWBRIDGE: I think, Pat -- if I can  
7 interject?

8 MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

9 MS. TROWBRIDGE: I think when you move  
10 the entries to the two museums, you change the  
11 circulation to them.

12 MR. TILLER: Of course. Of course.

13 MS. TROWBRIDGE: And certain of the  
14 fountains, for instance, outside African Art are  
15 oriented on axes with those pavilions. If you  
16 pull those pavilions out and move them elsewhere,  
17 that fountain exactly where it is in its current  
18 configuration no longer makes as much sense or any  
19 sense at all.

20 MR. TILLER: I recognize that.

21 MS. TROWBRIDGE: So that's why we think  
22 they will change.

1           Again, we're not at the design of the  
2 garden stage, but we think because the buildings  
3 that are the entries are changing and moving that  
4 there will be a certain amount of reconfigurations  
5 of the gardens.

6           MR. TILLER: I guess. You know, the  
7 Garden Conservancy, the Garden Club of America --  
8 you know, there's a lot of national angst over  
9 this. And in all of the discussions that I've had  
10 with all of these groups who said we understand  
11 your needs, circulation, blah, blah, blah, blah.  
12 But why couldn't you bring back 75 percent of it,  
13 80 percent of it, 82? I don't know.

14           I recognize you know, when you move the  
15 Jean Paul Carlhian Pavilions -- well you destroy  
16 them, but you move that function, there's going to  
17 be a change.

18           But this is a whole different critter in  
19 terms of vocabulary and association and feeling,  
20 and this is one of the ones I just can't get my  
21 arms around why -- it's just like we're not going  
22 to try to recreate the Lester Collins garden.

1           And that's the great mystery to many,  
2 many people around the country, why you --  
3 everyone just seems hell bent on like nope, we're  
4 wiping it from the scene. And that's that.

5           You know, I -- and I recognize everything  
6 you're saying, but I still believe and most of us  
7 believe you could probably get a lot of it back  
8 end or something very reminisce about it. And  
9 particularly, if there's a lot of configuration on  
10 the Hirshhorn garden, as I said in the last  
11 meeting, it just seems like we're going to wipe  
12 Lester Collins off the National Mall completely,  
13 all of his mid-century work.

14           And that's causing a lot of agita in the  
15 landscape community around here. So I was trying  
16 to figure out why big -- and it just doesn't seem  
17 to have even been a design challenge to try to  
18 bring it back, but rather, as something completely  
19 new.

20           But this is not a new comment from me to  
21 you all.

22           MS. TROWBRIDGE: No, I think -- I think

1 it's a very good point, and I think when we get to  
2 the design of the garden, we will look at lots of  
3 options.

4 SPEAKER: In ten years.

5 MS. TROWBRIDGE: In ten years or more.

6 But we think that there will be need a certain  
7 amount of change that we indicate diagrammatically  
8 here, just because of the change in circulation.

9 And her --

10 (Simultaneous discussion)

11 MR. TILLER: Of course. And as I said,  
12 Mrs. Haupt's niece left that open in the public  
13 hearings about that. But that's not -- I mean, I  
14 can't find an atom of the old design in that at  
15 all.

16 Thanks.

17 MS. KOSTER: Thank you for that comment.

18 Are there any other comments or questions?

19 (No response heard)

20 MS. KOSTER: I'm going to give you a  
21 little time to think. Yes? Because there always  
22 is one. There you go.

1           SPEAKER: Well, tied to Pat's comment,  
2 I'd love to see a variation of Alternative F  
3 that's, you know, Alternative G, that keeps the  
4 pavilions where they are now; smaller than the  
5 existing entrance pavilions.

6           And like I had commented very early in  
7 the meeting, you know, use some clever wayfinding  
8 devices to draw people to those from the Mall. So  
9 you -- you know, you would be able to do more of  
10 that restoration of the original landscape design.

11          MS. KOSTER: Thank you.

12          With that, seeing no other questions, I  
13 think we're going to go through the next steps in  
14 the process. So I'm going to turn it back over to  
15 Liz. There it is. Conclusions and next steps.

16          And before I leave, I also, just on  
17 behalf of NCPC, again, want to thank you for your  
18 participation tonight. So, Liz?

19          MS. ESTES: Great. So as we previously  
20 mentioned, the draft EIS is out for public review  
21 and comments will be accepted through the middle  
22 of January.

1           Tonight, you're at one of the public  
2   hearings, and there will also be another one next  
3   Monday from 10:00 to 12:00 here at NCPC.

4           The Smithsonian is doing a concept master  
5   plan hearing at NCPC on January 4th, and they're  
6   also presenting the concept master plan to the  
7   Commission of Fine Arts on January 18th.

8           We will also be having the 10th  
9   Consulting Parties meeting that will go over the  
10   programmatic agreement, and that would be around  
11   the January or February timeframe.

12           Once all the comments have been received  
13   on the draft EIS, we'll be taking those into  
14   consideration and be finalizing the final EIS,  
15   which will go out for public review in March of  
16   2018. And we're looking to have the NCPC final  
17   master plan hearing in May with a record of  
18   decision on the environmental impact statement in  
19   June of 2018.

20           And lastly, just to re-emphasize where  
21   you can submit comments, you can either submit the  
22   comments to Matt Flis here at NCPC or Michelle

1 Spofford at Smithsonian. You can also submit them  
2 by email at [commentsonsouthmailcampus@si.edu](mailto:commentsonsouthmailcampus@si.edu). And  
3 we will be accepting comments through Tuesday,  
4 January 16th.

5 Thank you.

6 [Whereupon, the public meeting was  
7 adjourned.]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22



## 1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

2

3 I, Jill Cohen-Wilson, do hereby certify that the  
4 foregoing proceeding was transcribed from a  
5 digital audio recording provided to me by Olender  
6 Reporting and thereafter was reduced to  
7 typewriting by me or under my direction.

8

9 I am not related to any of the parties in this  
10 matter, and this transcript is a true and accurate  
11 record of said audio recording to the best of my  
12 ability. The above information has been  
13 transcribed by me with a pledge of confidence, and  
14 I do hereby certify that I will not discuss or  
15 release the content or any information contained  
16 herein.

17

18

19

Jill Cohen-Wilson,

20

Legal Transcriptionist

1           Smithsonian Institution South Mall Plan

2                   Public Meeting

3

4

5

6

7

8                   10:00 p.m. to 12:00 p.m.

9                   Monday, December 18, 2017

10

11

12

13           National Capital Planning Commission

14                   401 9th Street, NW

15                   Suite 500N

16                   Washington, D.C. 20004

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 Commission Members:

2 JULIA KOSTER

3 ANNE TROWBRIDGE

4 ARAN COAKLEY

5 LIZ ESTES

6

7 Speakers:

8 ROB NIEWEG

9 THOMAS LUEBKE

10 SARAH BATCHELER

11 MATTHEW FLIS

12 ANN SCHULYER

13 BILL MARZELL, EHT TRACERIES

14 KATE PERRY

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MS. KOSTER: Okay. I think we'll go  
3 ahead and get started. My name is Julie Koster.  
4 I'm with the National Capital Planning Commission,  
5 and I want to welcome all of you here bright and  
6 early this Monday morning.

7 This is the second of two public meetings  
8 regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
9 for the Smithsonian Institution South Mall Campus  
10 Master Plan.

11 On behalf of the NCPC and the  
12 Smithsonian, welcome. We're really glad you're  
13 here today and we appreciate your participation in  
14 this process.

15 A couple of logistics. The bathrooms are  
16 back out through the lobby doors, down the hallway  
17 to your right. There is a code for the women's  
18 restroom that you can get from the receptionist.

19 Copies of the Draft Environmental Impact  
20 Statement and other resource documents are  
21 available online at dedicated pages on both the  
22 NCPC's web site. That's

1 ncpc.gov/project/southmall/, and at the  
2 Smithsonian's web site.

3           Today's meeting is being live streamed  
4 and transcribed, so if you want to see the video  
5 from this meeting or the meeting we held last  
6 Monday, they will both be available on those two  
7 dedicated web pages.

8           And there are lots of other ways for you  
9 to provide comments. There were comment cards  
10 available out front that you can provide today or  
11 send in. You can submit comments online. The  
12 email is down here, but it's  
13 [commentsonsouthmallcampus@si.edu](mailto:commentsonsouthmallcampus@si.edu).

14           And you can also mail in comments to  
15 either Matt Flis at NCPC or Michelle Spofford at  
16 the Smithsonian, and there is -- their mailing  
17 address there, and it's available on all the  
18 materials out in the lobby. So comments will be  
19 accepted through January 16th, 2018.

20           And I also wanted to note there are  
21 several different review processes under way for  
22 this project, including the review of the master

1 plan by the National Capital Planning Commission  
2 that will be heard at their upcoming January 4th  
3 meeting for the concept review.

4           There is a Section 106 process for  
5 Historic Preservation and the Environmental Review  
6 required by NEPA, which is the purpose of today's  
7 meeting. As we go through this, there will be a  
8 discussion on how all of those processes come and  
9 link together.

10           And I'll just reiterate the format for  
11 today's meeting. We'll start with a short  
12 presentation overall and the South Mall master  
13 plan including the purpose and need. Then we'll  
14 have presentations on each of the alternatives and  
15 the impacts from each of the alternatives.

16           After each alternative, we'll stop and  
17 take any questions or comments that you have, and  
18 then at the very end, there will be an opportunity  
19 to comment more broadly. So we tried to set this  
20 up so you could comment after each alternative  
21 when it's still a little fresh in your program  
22 presentation.

1           And again, we're recording this today, so  
2   if you do have a question or comment, we'll come  
3   by with a mic and bring it over to you, just so we  
4   can capture your comments. And I think that's it,  
5   so I'm now going to turn it over to Anne  
6   Trowbridge from the Smithsonian so get us going.  
7   Thank you.

8           MS. TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Julia and  
9   good morning. Thank you all for coming and  
10  listening online, as well.

11           Our agenda today is as follows: We will  
12  have a quick overview, and then present the  
13  alternatives, including the No-Action Alternatives  
14  and their environmental impacts, followed by a  
15  public comment period.

16           We have approximately a two-hour meeting,  
17  so we hope that will be sufficient to hear all of  
18  your comments today. We will then end with a  
19  summary of the next steps of the upcoming  
20  meetings.

21           Most of you have been to some of the ten  
22  previous public meetings, including consultant

1 party meetings, so you know about this project for  
2 the South Mall extending from 12th Street to 7th  
3 Street south of the mall and north of Independence  
4 Avenue.

5           We thank you for coming to those previous  
6 meetings. It has had an impact on the project in  
7 developing an Alternative F, which is the  
8 Smithsonian's preference, as well as making  
9 improvements to Alternative B.

10           Once again, here are the objectives that  
11 have always been the key aspects of the plan that  
12 we want to choose for the Smithsonian. Restoring  
13 and renovating historic buildings including the  
14 Castle; replacing roofs and mechanical systems at  
15 the end their useful life, and many improvements  
16 to circulation, including better visibility and  
17 connectivity to the mall for the Sackler and  
18 African Art museums.

19           We want to link and connect our visitor  
20 and education spaces, provide a modest amount of  
21 expansion for museums, and a centralized event  
22 space that includes nearby classrooms and other



1 smaller spaces so that we can have conferences and  
2 colloquia at the Smithsonian.

3           That's one of the things we now lack, as  
4 well as more art classrooms for the public to take  
5 Smithsonian associate classes as well as meeting  
6 space that is not tied up in scheduled classes.  
7 We want to improve our underground loading and  
8 very importantly, improve our energy performance  
9 for the new central utility plant.

10           Most of you are familiar with the  
11 National Environmental Policy Act. Under that  
12 act, federal agencies which NCPC is the lead on  
13 this, must prepare an environmental impact  
14 statement for actions that may have a significant  
15 environmental impact and of considered  
16 alternatives and use an inter-disciplinary  
17 approach in analyzing environmental impacts and  
18 take those into account in the federal agency  
19 decisions.

20           These are the steps of the NEPA process  
21 and we're right in the middle of it. During the  
22 review of the draft EIS document that will be

1 completed in mid-January, we will respond to  
2 comments and then prepare a final EIS document.

3 This will lead to the steps of submitting  
4 that to NCPC as a prerequisite to approval of the  
5 final Smithsonian South Mall Campus master plan.

6 We have been pursuing simultaneously a  
7 Section 106 process and many of you have been  
8 participants in that. We are now at step four.  
9 We have completed the assessment of effects and we  
10 are now developing a draft programmatic agreement.

11 Sharon Park expects to convene the  
12 consulting parties again in late January or  
13 February to review that document. With that, I'd  
14 like to introduce Aran Coakley of the Bjarke  
15 Ingels Group Architects and Liz Estes of Stantech  
16 who will present the alternatives and the  
17 Environment Impact Analysis.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. COAKLEY: Thank you, Anne. Aran  
20 Coakely from BIG Architects.

21 So today, we are evaluating three  
22 alternatives as well as the no action

1 alternatives. No-Action, the brief summary of it  
2 is that it's a continued maintenance of the  
3 existing conditions -- no systemic improvement to  
4 the utilities or of the circulation.

5           Alternative B: That's an alternative  
6 that we are looking to maintain the above grade  
7 condition in its existing state as much as  
8 possible; that doing infrastructural improvements  
9 such as improved loading, centralized mechanical  
10 plant.

11           Alternative D: Alternative D was the  
12 alternative that was initially presented back on  
13 2014. It calls for also improving the  
14 infrastructure, so new loading, a new centralized  
15 mechanical plant; but it also includes  
16 improvements to circulation.

17           And Alternative F. Alternative F was  
18 built on comments from the public where we were  
19 integrating a more thoughtful intervention at the  
20 Haupt Garden where we're to maintain the  
21 characteristics of the existing Haupt Garden, but  
22 we're also looking to improve the circulation as

1 well as the infrastructure of the campus  
2 facilities.

3           No action alternative. Again, keeping  
4 the campus as much in its existing condition as  
5 possible.

6           Below grade condition. No true  
7 improvement to that, just as is.

8           In comparison to the purpose and need,  
9 there is no restoration of the Castle in this  
10 scheme, just continued maintenance. No  
11 improvements to circulation to the campus to the  
12 wayfinding.

13           The loading facility will remain as is,  
14 so as the current condition, we still cannot load  
15 large museum exhibition pieces as well as the  
16 trash and the food services are not separated from  
17 collection deliveries.

18           Roofs. We'll continue to patch the roofs  
19 as needed, but the roof will not be replaced.

20           And visitor services in general will  
21 remain limited. The Castle will be where visitor  
22 services are mostly served, but there is no

1 central location that unites the Sackler, African  
2 Art and Freer, Hirshhorn or the AIB.

3 And also, the mechanical systems will  
4 remain as is, many of them out of date that  
5 require extensive maintenance, and also, they  
6 experience intermittent down time.

7 One of the issues with the current  
8 condition is the majority of the visitors are  
9 coming from the Mall, up to 75 percent. African  
10 Art and Sackler Museums are particularly impacted  
11 by this, because their entries are not visible  
12 from the Mall in their current condition.

13 So one of the goals of the master plan is  
14 to increase the visitorship at these two museums  
15 by improving the circulation and visibility of  
16 their entries.

17 The Quad Building itself -- the Quad  
18 Building, mostly below grade except for the entry  
19 pavilions. One of the existing conditions that  
20 the Smithsonian is looking to improve upon is the  
21 education area; moving the education area up to an  
22 area where it can receive some daylight, and also,

1 establish a connection between the Castle and this  
2 below grade condition.

3           This will allow for the most prominent  
4 portion of the South Mall Campus being the Castle  
5 to act as an icon for people to know to visit, and  
6 then allowing some connection between the current  
7 condition that does not allow for that.

8           So I'll pass this over to Liz Estes.

9           MS. ESTES: Good morning, everybody. I'm  
10 going to go over the impacts for each of the  
11 alternatives, and I'll go ahead and start with the  
12 no action alternative.

13           The No-Action Alternative. The No-Action  
14 Alternative, as Aran mentioned, focuses on basic  
15 repair, maintenance, both the lack of a  
16 coordinated approach to stabilizing, repairing and  
17 protecting resources on the campus would make them  
18 vulnerable to continued deterioration or future  
19 seismic or blast events resulting in a moderate  
20 adverse impact.

21           No major above grade changes would occur;  
22 therefore, there would be no impact to visual

1 resources under the No-Action Alternative.

2           With the No-Action Alternative, there  
3 would be no major excavation of soils. The soils  
4 in the Haupt Garden would be temporarily displaced  
5 during the repair to the existing roof membrane of  
6 the Quadrangle Building.

7           This would result in direct and indirect  
8 short-term negligible adverse impacts after the  
9 Quad roof has been repaired. So those would be  
10 reused or replaced with soils of a similar type.  
11 Therefore, there would be no direct or in direct  
12 long-term impacts.

13           No changes would occur to the  
14 configuration of the existing storm water system.  
15 Therefore, there would be no new direct impacts  
16 from storm water runoff.

17           Construction activities related to the  
18 repair to the roof of the Quadrangle Building  
19 could cause increased soil erosion and could  
20 travel off-site. A limited ability to retain and  
21 filter storm water on site would continue.

22           The No-Action Alternative would result in

1 indirect short-term negligible and minor long-term  
2 adverse impacts.

3           Repairs to the Quadrangle Building would  
4 generate fugitive dust and construction equipment  
5 would generate volatile organic compounds and  
6 nitrous oxides, creating short-term minor adverse  
7 impacts to air quality.

8           Outdated mechanical systems would not be  
9 replaced with modern units. The antiquated  
10 mechanical systems contribute to indoor air  
11 quality issues and would result in direct long-  
12 term minor adverse impacts. No indirect impacts  
13 would occur.

14           There would be no seismic retrofits  
15 performed and buildings would remain vulnerable to  
16 seismic activity. If future seismic events occur,  
17 the Castle and the AIB would likely experience  
18 damage. Without any seismic retrofits, there is a  
19 possible risk to human life in the event of a  
20 future earthquake.

21           There would also be the potential for an  
22 economic impact from the potential loss of



1 collections and buildings. This would result in a  
2 long-term major adverse impact.

3           Due to the age of some of the buildings  
4 within the South Mall Campus, asbestos and lead-  
5 based paint are likely to be present. Removal of  
6 asbestos and lead-based paint would occur during  
7 building maintenance resulting in minor short-term  
8 adverse impacts. However, there would be long-  
9 term beneficial impacts because asbestos and lead-  
10 based paint would no longer be there.

11           With the No-Action Alternative, no safety  
12 or security upgrades would be made to the South  
13 Mall Campus. Seismic vulnerability of the Castle  
14 and AIB present a major human life and -- risk to  
15 human life and economic impact. There would be no  
16 direct impacts.

17           The continued use of GSA steam and  
18 chilled water and antiquated mechanical systems  
19 resulting in increased emissions would result in  
20 direct negligible long-term adverse impacts from  
21 greenhouse gas emissions.

22           The demand for energy from existing

1 inefficient mechanical systems in older buildings  
2 would result in short and long-term indirect  
3 negligible adverse impacts to climate change.

4           There would be no changes to the South  
5 Mall Campus layouts, wayfinding, pathway  
6 configuration or view sheds under the No-Action  
7 Alternative. Therefore, there would be no direct  
8 or indirect impacts to land-use planning and  
9 policies.

10           As previously mentioned, the No-Action  
11 Alternative represents a continuation of existing  
12 visitor use and experience provided by the  
13 Smithsonian. Visitors would continue to be able  
14 to access museums and gardens within the South  
15 Mall Campus, but no clear east-west pedestrian  
16 connection would be created, and wayfinding would  
17 not be improved.

18           Furthermore, access and visibility from  
19 the National Mall would not be improved. These  
20 impacts would be direct, moderate, long-term and  
21 adverse.

22           The implementation of the Southwest

1 Ecodistrict could increase visitorship, but  
2 visitor services would not be enhanced, resulting  
3 in indirect long-term adverse impact. During  
4 construction, there would be closures to exhibits.

5           With the No-Action Alternative, no  
6 changes to GSA, PEPCO or D.C. Water Utility  
7 Supplies would occur. Therefore, no changes to  
8 utility demands would occur. However, continual  
9 need to repair mechanical systems would have  
10 short-term minor adverse impacts on utilities.

11           No sustainability measures would be  
12 implemented, which would continue to cause to  
13 long-term minor adverse impacts to utilities.  
14 Energy consumption may increase as mechanical  
15 systems continue to age and become less efficient.

16           The South Mall Campus would also remain  
17 on GSA steam and chilled water which could  
18 potentially result in deterioration of the museum  
19 artifacts and artwork over time.

20           Minimal construction waste would be  
21 generated. Waste would continue to be generated  
22 at its current level and collections, delivery and

1 distribution would continue to share space with  
2 food and waste streams, increasing the risk of  
3 damage or deterioration of collection items over  
4 time, resulting in indirect minor long-term  
5 adverse impacts. No direct impacts would occur.

6           No new bicycle, vehicle, pedestrian or  
7 transit trips would be generated if the  
8 Smithsonian did not implement the master plan for  
9 the South Mall Campus. In addition, there would  
10 not be a new consolidated loading dock for the  
11 South Mall Campus. The use of the two existing  
12 loading docks would continue to have long-term  
13 moderate adverse impact on traffic surrounding the  
14 South Mall Campus.

15           And here is a diagram of the -- or a  
16 chart of the impacts to the No-Action Alternative  
17 which has been provided in a handout to you.

18           MS. KOSTER: So we're just going to take  
19 a break here and see if you have any questions or  
20 comments about the No-Action Alternative. Here we  
21 go.

22           This is kind of -- again, this will sort

1 of be the format of the meeting as we'll go  
2 through each of the alternatives and see if you  
3 have any comments or anything else.

4 (Pause)

5 MR. NIEWEG: Good morning. Rob Nieweg on  
6 behalf of the National Trust for Historic  
7 Preservation.

8 A question. Under the No-Action  
9 Alternative, is there explanation of the, I guess,  
10 ongoing current status of the Arts and Industries  
11 Building in terms of use?

12 Thank you.

13 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Currently, we have an  
14 interim use of the Arts and Industries Building  
15 for special events. We are currently planning  
16 some further renovations that will make space for  
17 exhibits.

18 The long-term programmatic use of that  
19 building has not been determined. There have been  
20 several proposals and bills before Congress,  
21 including creation of a Latino museum, a women's  
22 museum; several proposals had mentioned that as a

1 potential site.

2           There has been no action. So I think in  
3 the No-Action Alternative, it would assume the  
4 status quo. Of course, the Smithsonian does not  
5 control actions by Congress, and so this is a No-  
6 Action Alternative with respect to the  
7 Smithsonian's plan, if there could be a designated  
8 museum. This is a baseline for comparison.

9           MR. LUEBKE: But to clarify, there is no  
10 museum designated at this time.

11           MS. TROWBRIDGE: No. But there are bills  
12 before Congress, I believe that designate it as  
13 either a women's museum or a Latino museum --  
14 several bills.

15           MS. BATCHELER: On the same topic, on the  
16 -- in the presentation where it talks about --

17           MS. KOSTER: I'm sorry. Can you just --

18           MS. BATCHELER: Sorry. Sarah Batcheler -  
19 -

20           MS. KOSTER: Thank you.

21           MS. BATCHELER: -- Commission of Fine  
22 Arts.

1           Comment to all above grade: There is  
2 something indicated to happen at the A&I Building.  
3 Are you going to be -- there is like a little blue  
4 box on the A&I Building.

5           MR. COAKLEY: Oh, that would be part of  
6 Alternative B, but it's --

7           (Simultaneous discussion)

8           MS. BATCHELER: It says Common to All.

9           MR. COAKLEY: It's Common to All, but it  
10 will introduce the concept of it in Alternative B.

11          MS. BATCHELER: Okay. So will you be  
12 listing impacts on the A&I Building from that  
13 intervention, whatever it is, that you'll tell us  
14 about?

15          MR. COAKLEY: We do discuss that.

16          MS. BATCHELER: In?

17          MR. COAKLEY: In the EIS.

18          MS. BATCHELER: Okay.

19          MS. KOSTER: Go ahead.

20          MR. LUEBKE: Tom Luebke, Commission for  
21 Fine Arts. This is actually a -- just a question  
22 for the EIS experts.

1           Are these impacts supposed to be -- is  
2   there any kind of impact, potential, positive,  
3   negative, good, bad, indifferent?

4           I'm not sure. It's a technical question  
5   about process.

6           MS. ESTES: Yes. We looked at a range --  
7   you know, whether it's going to be adverse or  
8   beneficial and the degree of impact.

9           MR. LUEBKE: And what about potential?

10          MS. ESTES: Yes.

11          MR. LUEBKE: Okay. Okay, I --

12          MS. ESTES: Yes.

13          (Simultaneous discussion)

14          MR. LUEBKE: Perhaps I'm thinking of it  
15   more in terms of the preservation ones where you  
16   construe the impacts as negative. You know, so  
17   much to talk about, programmatic benefits in this  
18   kind of thing.

19          And I'm not an expert on this. I'm  
20   looking for -- is there anybody else on -- who is  
21   not being paid to do this on the other side who  
22   can inform this question about EIS impact



1 valuation?

2 SPEAKER: Do you have a --

3 MR. LUEBKE: No, I'm just curious.

4 Like for example, under seismic  
5 vulnerability -- your direct long-term major  
6 adverse impacts from lack of seismic protection.

7 Well, it is a potential adverse impact,  
8 but there is -- it isn't a foregone conclusion  
9 that there's an impact. That's just an example.

10 And also, there's programmatic benefits  
11 that are listed as impacts. Now, I don't know if  
12 that, again, under the EIS protocol or the way  
13 that you actually conduct this, if that's okay to  
14 talk about programmatic benefits from doing  
15 something or nothing at all.

16 This is a No-Action Alternative, so then  
17 I just raise potential. Is it -- is it reasonable  
18 to say under visitor use and experience, there are  
19 direct long-term moderate adverse impacts from  
20 lack of improvements to the South Mall Campus?

21 Is that an adverse impact that we can  
22 talk about in terms of visitor use?

1           I mean, theoretically, sure, but this is  
2 a No-Action Alternative. We're talking about  
3 impacts from doing nothing. It's just a  
4 procedural question.

5           MS. ESTES: You can have impacts from  
6 doing nothing with a No-Action Alternative. It's  
7 the baseline. What is occurring right now?

8           So if you're having -- right now, by not  
9 doing anything is going to have an impact, then  
10 that's what you discuss under the No-Action  
11 Alternative.

12           MR. LUEBKE: Okay, that's fair enough.  
13 Thank you.

14           MS. BATCHELER: I still don't -- I  
15 actually was also confused by that earlier  
16 (Laughs).

17           So it seems to make sense, for example,  
18 for maintenance, if you're not able to, you know,  
19 get in and replace a roof or whatever, that that  
20 might have a long-term direct impact on water  
21 infiltration in the building.

22           But I don't understand direct or indirect

1 -- I can't remember what it was -- adverse impact  
2 on programming which you're just not adding.

3           Like you know, you have what you have  
4 now. So is it -- it's not a direct impact on what  
5 you have now if that's the baseline, if I  
6 understand what you're saying.

7           So why would it be an impact what is a  
8 future potential expansion or something like that?

9           SPEAKER: Environmental impact.

10          MS. BATCHELER: Right, as an  
11 environmental impact. Well, as a -- I mean,  
12 you've got these categories within the NEPA  
13 evaluation, and I just don't understand how that  
14 ends up being a negative.

15          MS. TROWBRIDGE: One of our impacts is  
16 the visitor experience, and if we cannot -- by No-  
17 Action, cannot provide the visitor experience we  
18 want to, then that has some impact.

19          (Simultaneous discussion)

20          MS. BATCHELER: I guess I'm still  
21 confused. Like is it making the visitor  
22 experience worse that you have now? Like that --

1 to me, that would seem like a negative impact.

2           Like if you suddenly -- like you had to  
3 close the whole wing, and therefore, people  
4 couldn't go in there that would be clearly a  
5 negative impact. But if you're just not improving  
6 what you have already, how does that get  
7 evaluated?

8           MS. ESTES: It depends on the impact  
9 topic. But if what you have right now is not --  
10 is causing an impact to say, visitor use and  
11 experience because for mechanical systems, if the  
12 mechanical systems could contribute to the  
13 deterioration of artifacts and things, that  
14 contributes to a negative adverse impact to  
15 visitor use and experience.

16           MS. BATCHELER: That's the mechanical  
17 area, but the first one that I understand --

18           MS. ESTES: Mm-hmm.

19           MS. BATCHELER: -- like not replacing the  
20 roof, not replacing mechanical systems, not  
21 improving the loading. All of those you know,  
22 seem to have negative impact.

1           It's just maybe this visitor experience  
2 is a more kind of amorphous category; that it's  
3 hard to understand where the impacts come from.

4           MR. LUEBKE: I mean, I think it's  
5 important to make a distinction. I mean, purpose  
6 and need are planning principles, but it doesn't  
7 strike me as a -- it doesn't actually strike me as  
8 a salient issue for environmental impacts.

9           And the things that you are saying could  
10 be subordinated into another question about  
11 mechanical operation or visual impact or  
12 something. You know, it's all very nice because,  
13 if we don't do anything, we actually can't put in  
14 the -- you know, the 35,000 sequoia trees we kind  
15 of hoped to do.

16           It's sort of putting it out there in the  
17 land -- it doesn't actually have a physical impact  
18 and it doesn't actually exist. So if it's under  
19 the No-Action Alternative, it just seems very  
20 strange to me.

21           And is there anybody from NCPC who can  
22 enlighten us in terms of the way the EIS should be

1 written and by what criteria? I'd love to get  
2 somebody to respond to this who isn't being paid  
3 to prepare this document.

4 MS. KOSTER: I'd ask Matt if you have any  
5 thoughts on this at this time.

6 MR. FLIS: I guess I'm trying to  
7 understand exactly -- the question is what is the  
8 -- you're asking what the resource is that's being  
9 impacted?

10 MR. LUEBKE: Yes, a resource, not a  
11 visitor experience. There's not a resource.  
12 That's a programmatic goal or it's intangible.  
13 Intangible. Whatever Visitor X thinks, feels,  
14 experiences is not -- I don't understand that as  
15 an environmental important, and so I don't  
16 understand why it's being used this way to talk  
17 about one version or another.

18 MS. ESTES: Right. And with NEPA, you're  
19 not just looking at environmental impacts as bugs  
20 and bunnies and things like that. You look at the  
21 impacts to the human environment, which includes  
22 cultural resources, which includes all those

1 different things.

2           So yes, we do look at the impacts to  
3 visitor use and experience.

4           MR. LUEBKE: But again, you can talk  
5 about bugs, bunnies, buildings, sidewalks, plants,  
6 trees, exhibits, et cetera, but you keep taking it  
7 back to this question of experience, which is not  
8 actually a tangible thing.

9           So I'm trying to understand, under the  
10 way -- under the law, under NEPA, is this actually  
11 a category to be considered? And if you don't  
12 have -- somebody should know the answer to this.

13           MS. ESTES: Okay.

14           MR. LUEBKE: Right now. I mean, I'm  
15 sorry.

16           MS. KOSTER: Okay. All right. I think  
17 that's a good question.

18           (Simultaneous discussion)

19           MS. ESTES: It is a topic that you can  
20 discuss under an environmental impact statement;  
21 yes.

22           MS. BATCHELER: So maybe the issue is

1   that it seems to be sort of an infinitely  
2   expandable category where you would always -- you  
3   can always improve the visitor experience.

4               So at what point do you decide that  
5   you're not improving it enough? You know? Or  
6   something like that. It's hard to understand what  
7   the criteria are for judging this category, so  
8   maybe you could provide either today or in a  
9   future meeting, more information about how you  
10  came to this conclusion.

11              MS. ESTES: Sure. And at the beginning  
12  of that chapter in the EIS, it explains how we  
13  determined whether it's a negligible minor,  
14  moderate or major impact, but we can also respond  
15  to that in the comments, too, as well, for the  
16  final EIS.

17              (Discussion off the record)

18              MS. KOSTER: I think that that was a very  
19  useful topic to highlight, and that's something  
20  we'll follow up on.

21              MR. FLIS: Yes.

22              MS. KOSTER: Are there any other



1 questions at this time?

2 (No response heard)

3 MS. KOSTER: Okay. I think we'll roll in  
4 to the next alternative, so I'm going to turn it  
5 back over to Aran and Liz.

6 MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

7 (Discussion off the record)

8 MS. ESTES: So in the environmental  
9 impact statement, we looked at various different  
10 resources, and in our analysis, there were ones  
11 that either had no impact or negligible I mean.  
12 And so these categories are listed here, and we  
13 looked at them and then dismissed them from  
14 further detail.

15 And so these are geology, wildlife and  
16 vegetation, threatened and endangered species,  
17 ground water and hydrology, surface water and  
18 wetlands, flood plains, coastal zone,  
19 archaeological resources, noise, community  
20 facilities and services, population and housing,  
21 economy and employment and environmental justice.

22 SPEAKER: Are these dismissed for all of

1 the -- every -- all of them?

2 (Simultaneous discussion)

3 MS. ESTES: That is correct.

4 SPEAKER: Okay.

5 MS. ESTES: Yes. Because we looked at  
6 them and they would not have an impact on any of  
7 the alternatives or a negligible impact.

8 MS. SCHULYER: Could you go back to that  
9 list, because I'd like to use that maybe to  
10 respond to their concern to the previous question.

11 SPEAKER: Ann, you need to use the  
12 microphone, please.

13 MS. SCHULYER: I'm sorry. I'm Ann  
14 Schuyler with general counsel.

15 I was a little perplexed by your  
16 question, but I think I now understand that as any  
17 type of -- the impacts that are analyzed from an  
18 environmental impact statement are not necessarily  
19 those that are related to natural resources. You  
20 have a very broad array of topics and if it clears  
21 things up, a human environment.

22 So the human environment, I think, goes

1 to the issue of the visitor experience. What the  
2 visitor is experiencing in that museum is part of  
3 the environment -- the human environment.

4           So it's not just natural resources. And  
5 if you look here for example, environmental  
6 justice is not a natural resource, but it goes to  
7 the impact of the project on the minority  
8 populations. So I think that was perhaps in the  
9 same vein.

10           MR. LUEBKE: I guess my concern is I  
11 didn't lead with it to the natural resources  
12 whatsoever. I was talking about physical  
13 resources, generally. For example, on  
14 environmental justice.

15           This plan doesn't do -- there is no  
16 program here for addressing environmental justice.  
17 You could deeply construe this as this is an  
18 adverse -- major adverse impact, because it  
19 doesn't do -- it doesn't have environmental  
20 justice.

21           By the same logic, if it doesn't improve  
22 visitor experience, it has major shortcomings as a

1 plan. It's a No-Action Alternative. I don't  
2 think we can say that.

3 (Simultaneous discussion)

4 MR. LUEBKE: It's a physical action and  
5 you're not linking it to anything. And you can  
6 make the same argument in environmental justice.

7 MS. SCHULYER: Well, you don't -- you  
8 don't -- for example, environmental justice -- if  
9 someone is not present, it's not wrong to not  
10 address it.

11 MR. LUEBKE: So you're saying there's no  
12 environmental at the Smithsonian right now.

13 MS. SCHULYER: There's no environmental  
14 justice issues that have been identified.

15 MR. LUEBKE: Okay. So it's up to  
16 somebody to identify them.

17 MS. SCHULYER: If they think they're out  
18 there and that this document is deficient for not  
19 having identified them.

20 MS. BATCHELER: So the other part of this  
21 is that this is an impact on a future potential;  
22 right? It's not an impact -- maybe I

1 misunderstood, but my understanding was that this  
2 -- the impacts are on the current state. Right?

3 MS. SCHULYER: Correct. Correct.

4 MS. BATCHELER: So the impact on the  
5 current state of the No-Action Alternative on  
6 visitor experience seems to me that it would be  
7 null, because you're not improving it, but you're  
8 also not making it worse.

9 MS. SCHULYER: But they're obviously  
10 aware that there are problems, and so the failure  
11 to address them is what they're trying to do with  
12 the No-Action Alternative.

13 MS. BATCHELER: Okay. So maybe that gets  
14 back to this question of what exactly is in this  
15 thing. Like is it providing enough bathrooms?  
16 That's understandable. Is it making people feel  
17 more inspired? That's harder to understand.

18 MS. SCHULYER: I think part of it is  
19 they've talked a lot about wayfaring and signage.  
20 And if people don't know where they're going and  
21 they're confused, that doesn't make this an  
22 enjoyable museum experience.

1 MS. BATCHELER: So again, then, I think  
2 if you can provide more information about what  
3 exactly is included here --

4 MR. LUEBKE: Yes.

5 MS. BATCHELER: -- as a measureable --

6 MR. FLIS: I think -- yeah, I think we  
7 have a little bit more clarity now in terms of a  
8 comment. And I think we can look at --

9 (Simultaneous discussion)

10 MS. TROWBRIDGE: There's more explanation  
11 of these things in the document, if you do read  
12 it.

13 MS. BATCHELER: Okay.

14 MS. TROWBRIDGE: And --

15 MS. BATCHELER: This is the one that --

16 (Simultaneous discussion)

17 SPEAKER: The draft. The draft EIS.  
18 Yes.

19 MR. FLIS: We will help provide some  
20 clarity.

21 MS. BATCHELER: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. KOSTER: Thank you again for that

1 comment and that discussion. And I think we'll  
2 now move it along to the next alternative.

3 MR. COAKLEY: So the common to all --  
4 when we say common to all, it's meaning common to  
5 Alternative B, D and F. These are components that  
6 are found in all three of those action  
7 alternatives.

8 I'll just list through them quickly:  
9 Loading dock -- so a centralized loading dock for  
10 the campus.

11 Restoration of the Castle including  
12 seismic retrofit.

13 A new entry at the Freer to allow east-  
14 west circulation and handicap access.

15 Removal of the loading dock doors at the  
16 east side of AIB. An installation of visitor  
17 doors to again, allow circulation through the  
18 campus.

19 Removal of a small portion of the  
20 Hirshhorn's plaza wall, again, to allow  
21 circulation across the campus.

22 Removal of the loading area between -- at

1 the AIB between the Hirshhorn and the AIB, and  
2 removal of the Ripley Pavilion as well as removal  
3 of the existing Quad loading dock.

4           Below grade, we are showing the loading  
5 area as well as that new loading ramp and a  
6 utility connection between the central utility  
7 plant to the Hirshhorn allowing the entire campus  
8 to be served by the new central utility plant.

9           (Pause)

10           MS. ESTES: The slide showing the impacts  
11 on cultural resources are also provided in the  
12 handout so that it's easier to read, but they've  
13 been organized by resource. In those cases, the  
14 impacts on the Smithsonian Quadrangle Historic  
15 District are the same as those on the National  
16 Mall Historic District and their contributing  
17 resources.

18           A majority of the interventions common to  
19 all alternatives focused on maintenance and repair  
20 and will result in beneficial impacts. There is a  
21 potential for an adverse impact resulting from  
22 perimeter security, the new consolidated loading



1 ramp, the central utility plant, seismic bracing  
2 of the Castle and replacement of the Quadrangle  
3 roof membrane. The direct impacts are long-term,  
4 minor and adverse and they're also long-term and  
5 beneficial.

6           Similarly, elements common to all  
7 alternatives have the potential for adverse  
8 impacts on visual resources subject to continued  
9 design development. In all action alternatives,  
10 the removal of the Ripley Pavilion represents a  
11 beneficial impact by restoring the view shed  
12 between the Mall and the Quadrangle. The direct  
13 impacts would be negligible to minor in nature and  
14 adverse. There would also be long-term beneficial  
15 impacts.

16           MS. BATCHELER: Sorry. Procedural  
17 question.

18           So this slide says cultural resources,  
19 and then you went to visual resources. Are these  
20 --

21           MS. ESTES: I just did a summary of that  
22 slide there.

1           MS. BATCHELER: Okay. But you didn't go  
2 through --

3           (Simultaneous discussion)

4           MS. ESTES: The presentation is a high  
5 level presentation of what's in the environmental  
6 impact statement.

7           MS. BATCHELER: Okay, so -- so you want -  
8 - I have question about one of these things that's  
9 been assigned to a beneficial long-term impact  
10 which I don't think is --

11          (Simultaneous discussion)

12          MS. KOSTER: Let's get through this  
13 presentation. Hold your question and we'll come  
14 back to it at the beginning?

15          MS. ESTES: Right, because I'm going to  
16 go through the impacts, and then after each  
17 alternative, then there will be -- allowed for  
18 comments.

19          Soils would be excavated 20 to 30 feet  
20 beneath the footprint of the Castle. As with the  
21 No-Action Alternative, soils in the Haupt Garden  
22 would be temporarily displaced during the repair

1 to the existing roof membrane of the Quad.

2 Under all of the action alternatives, the  
3 Ripley Garden would be expanded. That would  
4 require minor grading, leveling and soil  
5 disturbance. These activities would result in  
6 short-term minor directly and negligible indirect  
7 adverse impacts to soils.

8 These activities would also permanently  
9 remove soils and the topography of the site would  
10 be permanently altered from the construction of a  
11 new loading ramp creating a direct minor long-term  
12 adverse impact to soils and topography, but soils  
13 would be added to expand the Ripley garden where  
14 non currently exist.

15 The clearing of vegetation and green  
16 space during construction would temporarily reduce  
17 the site's ability to absorb storm water which  
18 would increase the amount of storm water on site.  
19 In comparison to the existing conditions, the  
20 amount of impervious surface overall would reduce  
21 by 4,500 square feet under Alternative B, 1,110  
22 square feet under -- 11,000 square feet under

1 Alternative D and 18,000 square feet under  
2 Alternative F, allowing for storm water to be  
3 absorbed.

4           The Haupt Garden would continue to  
5 function as a green roof. Pervious pavers,  
6 bioretention areas and additional plantings would  
7 be added where possible. The storm water systems  
8 on-site would be upgraded including the use of  
9 cisterns to capture and store storm water.

10           Storm water would be reused to irrigate  
11 the campus or to flush toilets. The indirect and  
12 direct impacts resulting from the actions common  
13 to all master plan alternatives would have minor  
14 short-term adverse impacts and moderate long-term  
15 beneficial impacts.

16           Under all the action alternatives, the  
17 Castle would be retrofitted using base isolation  
18 and traditional cross-bracing methods. Base  
19 isolation of the Castle would limit the forces  
20 that a seismic event would have on the building.  
21 By limiting the forces, the number of cross-braces  
22 would be limited.

1           Progressive cost measures would be  
2   installed in the AIB. Seismic and blast  
3   protection would result in direct long-term major  
4   beneficial impacts. During construction, direct  
5   short-term minor adverse impacts would occur.

6           With all of the master alternatives,  
7   construction, demolition, excavation and  
8   renovation would adversely impact human health and  
9   safety from the removal of asbestos and lead-based  
10   paints, which would be short-term.

11           But with the removal of asbestos and  
12   lead-based paint, long-term beneficial impacts  
13   would result from no longer having these materials  
14   present. Additionally, as with any construction  
15   project, the potential exists for safety hazards  
16   which would adversely impact human health and  
17   safety.

18           In the long-term, security upgrades would  
19   reduce the likelihood of a campus security breach  
20   which would protect the safety of visitors and  
21   employees.

22           Base isolation as previously mentioned of

1 the Castle, would limit the forces of a seismic  
2 event would have on the building, and by limiting  
3 these forces, you limit the number of cross-braces  
4 that would be necessary. Seismic and blast  
5 protection would result in direct long-term  
6 moderate beneficial impacts to human health and  
7 safety.

8           Construction, demolition, excavation and  
9 renovation activities would temporarily impact air  
10 quality. Fugitive dust would be created and  
11 construction equipment would generate VOCs and  
12 nitrous oxides creating short-term minor adverse  
13 impacts to air quality.

14           A new central utility plant would be  
15 constructed that would use modern energy efficient  
16 units, and the Smithsonian would no longer use GSA  
17 steam and chilled water from their central utility  
18 -- heating plant.

19           There would ultimately be direct minor  
20 long-term beneficial impacts. The improvements to  
21 the mechanical equipment would have a beneficial  
22 impact on air quality.

1           Construction equipment would emit carbon  
2 dioxide. These emissions would have short-term  
3 minor adverse impacts to greenhouse gas levels. A  
4 new central utility plant with sustainable  
5 building design would allow the Smithsonian to  
6 reduce the amount of energy needed to be purchased  
7 from the energy grid.

8           This is expected to result in a 39  
9 percent carbon dioxide reduction. This would  
10 result in long-term indirect and direct negligible  
11 beneficial impacts.

12           The land use of the South Mall Campus  
13 would not change. The removal of the existing  
14 loading ramp next to the Freer Gallery and the  
15 reconfiguration of the Ripley Garden would create  
16 a more visible and inviting pedestrian connection  
17 between the National Mall and the Southwest  
18 Ecodistrict.

19           The elements common to all master plan  
20 alternatives would be consistent with the goals of  
21 the Southwest Ecodistrict and the National Mall  
22 plans, and the guiding principles of the federal

1 elements of the comprehensive plan for the  
2 National Capital. This would have direct and  
3 indirect long-term and short-term moderate  
4 beneficial impacts by complementing other planning  
5 efforts.

6           With all master plan alternatives,  
7 construction, demolition, excavation and  
8 renovation would adversely impact visitor use and  
9 experience. Temporary closures to areas within  
10 the South Mall Campus would impact pedestrians and  
11 bicyclists affecting their ability to travel  
12 directly between memorials and monuments and  
13 recreational spots within the vicinity of the  
14 South Mall Campus.

15           Relocation of exhibits would occur during  
16 construction, which would disrupt the visitor  
17 experience. Upon completion of all phases of the  
18 master plan, visitorship to the South Mall Campus  
19 is expected to increase.

20           A centralized visitor center would  
21 enhance visitor orientation and underground  
22 connections to the Quadrangle Building.



1 Circulation, wayfinding and visibility  
2 improvements within and outside the campus would  
3 be improved.

4           In addition, new educational museum and  
5 event spaces would be created all resulting in  
6 major long-term beneficial impacts to the visitor  
7 use of the South Mall Campus and their experience.  
8 In addition, the Southwest Ecodistrict would  
9 increase visitorship resulting in indirect long-  
10 term beneficial impacts.

11           With the implementation of the master  
12 plan, there would be a complete replacement and  
13 upgrade to the mechanical, electrical, water,  
14 sanitary and storm water infrastructure, and the  
15 South Mall Campus would be removed from GSAM steam  
16 and chilled water.

17           The proposed changes in programming and  
18 the addition of food service would require  
19 additional utility service compared to the current  
20 condition. However, the central utility plant  
21 would provide a more efficient and reliable  
22 system.

1           Campus-wide energy efficient and  
2 sustainability measures would be implemented.  
3 This would result in reductions of energy and  
4 water supplies throughout the South Mall Campus  
5 which would lessen the burden on the utility  
6 providers in the region.

7           This would have a direct long-term  
8 moderate beneficial impact to utilities.  
9 Indirectly, short-term and minor adverse impacts  
10 would occur from the disruption of utilities  
11 during construction.

12           Waste will be generated while  
13 construction is occurring. A minimum of 50  
14 percent of the construction waste would be reused,  
15 salvaged or recycled. The remaining would be  
16 disposed of at a landfill.

17           The increase in construction waste  
18 results in short-term negligible minor --  
19 negligible to minor direct adverse impacts.  
20 Having a central loading facility would  
21 consolidate waste streams into one location which  
22 increases the efficiency of waste handling.

1           A central loading facility would allow  
2   for waste streams, collections, deliveries and  
3   distribution to be separated. The direct long-  
4   term moderate beneficial impacts would result from  
5   streamlining the waste management of the South  
6   Mall Campus.

7           In the long-term, the increased waste  
8   generated on the South Mall Campus would result in  
9   indirect short and long-term negligible adverse  
10   impacts. The Smithsonian would expand their  
11   composting recycle, reuse and return to vendor  
12   programs, and 80 percent of the waste would be  
13   diverted from landfills.

14           If any of the master plan alternatives  
15   were implemented, additional vehicle trips would  
16   be generated and bicycle and pedestrian and  
17   transit trips are also expected to increase  
18   resulting in a direct long-term negligible adverse  
19   impact to the local transportation network.

20           While a new loading dock would introduce  
21   a new signal control curb cut, the two  
22   uncontrolled driveways would be eliminated. This

1 would have a net benefit to overall traffic  
2 operations and not generate new truck trips.

3           This would result in long-term beneficial  
4 impacts to the local roadways. Connectivity  
5 enhancement would reduce pedestrian demand on  
6 adjacent sidewalks and visitor safety during  
7 construction would be accomplished through a  
8 health and safety plan, signage and fencing.  
9 There would be no indirect impacts.

10           And again, here is the impact matrix that  
11 is provided in your handout for the impacts common  
12 to all alternatives. And with that, if anybody  
13 has any comments on common alternatives?

14           MS. KOSTER: I think there was --. There  
15 was a question, so we'll go ahead and take a look  
16 at that, and then I think we have a question over  
17 here.

18           So before I get going, you were referring  
19 to page 40 --

20           (Simultaneous discussion)

21           MS. BATCHELER: Yes.

22           MS. KOSTER: -- in your handout? Okay.

1           So if you can just go ahead and ask your  
2 question again, and thanks for your patience.

3           MS. BATCHELER: Okay, sure. It's no  
4 problem.

5           MS. KOSTER: All right.

6           MS. BATCHELER: I didn't -- yeah, it was  
7 really about when to ask a question. So you went  
8 in -- over in a lot of detail all the categories  
9 except for the cultural resources, which is the  
10 one that I wanted to comment on.

11           And several of these items are listed  
12 under cultural resources, not under seismic  
13 vulnerability or whatever, but under cultural  
14 resources as being beneficial long-term impact.

15           And I would -- I think I disagree with  
16 that. For example, the Castle blast protection.  
17 That is something that may end up being a  
18 beneficial long-term impact under another  
19 category, but under cultural resources blast  
20 protection of a building often has quite  
21 significant impacts on the building fabric.

22           Same with the base isolation, same with

1 at the Hirshhorn, the Sculpture Garden walls with  
2 an opening being put into it.

3           So I'm not sure why these are listed  
4 under cultural resources as having a beneficial  
5 impact, when in this category, to my mind, it  
6 would have a negative impact. It may be  
7 beneficial somewhere else.

8           MS. KOSTER: All right. Thank you for  
9 that comment, and I think that's something that  
10 will be addressed as they look at all the comments  
11 that come in. I think -- unless there's something  
12 you would like to --

13           MS. ESTES: No, that's correct.

14           MS. KOSTER: Okay. All right. Over  
15 here? She'll bring the mic over to you.

16           MR. NIEWEG: Thank you. Rob Nieweg from  
17 the National Trust.

18           Two comments. Both related to the  
19 elements common to all. First, looking on the  
20 matrix, the issue of removal of a portion of the  
21 Hirshhorn wall is not mentioned in the matrix  
22 under elements common to all as an adverse effect,

1 but there is a blurb under alternative paths with  
2 regard to the removal of the Hirshhorn wall being  
3 a long-term minor adverse impact.

4           And presumably since that removal is  
5 common to all the alternatives, the fact that it's  
6 adverse under F should -- I mean, it's adverse  
7 under all of them, so common to all. And with  
8 regard to that, I think I'm echoing CFA on this  
9 question of how best to present this to the  
10 public.

11           Because on the one hand, removal of the  
12 original Hirshhorn wall, which is marked as the  
13 only demolition going on common to all -- removal  
14 on the Hirshhorn wall on the one hand is a long-  
15 term minor adverse impact, and on the other hand,  
16 I think you're arguing that the additional or the  
17 improved circulation creates a long-term major  
18 beneficial impact.

19           And we'll be looking more closely at this  
20 question, specifically the treatment of the  
21 Hirshhorn wall, but the DEIS ought to include a  
22 detailed explanation of how it is that that

1 removal of that -- the only piece of destruction  
2 common to all, how that removal constitutes a  
3 major beneficial impact, first on the Hirshhorn  
4 wall.

5           And then second, elements common to all -  
6 - we ask as our first comment that there is no  
7 provision for a future use for the Arts and  
8 Industries building, so that it seems to us that  
9 the elements common to all ought to note that this  
10 master plan for this South Mall Campus does not  
11 include a major -- it does include -- the building  
12 is being used to some degree, but there is no  
13 major long-term master plan use for this building.

14           And following the logic that we debated  
15 earlier, there is an adverse impact from the lack  
16 of provision of a use. This master plan does not  
17 provide for a long-term use.

18           And it may be that some other party is  
19 barring -- Congress -- is an impediment to the  
20 long-term use of this, but this DEIS ought to,  
21 under elements common to all master plan elements,  
22 all master plan alternatives, note that there is



1 no -- under this master plan, long-term, there is  
2 no provision for a long-term term use.

3 That creates a lack of use, which creates  
4 a major adverse impact. Thank you. And we'll  
5 note all of this in our written comments, as well.

6 MS. TROWBRIDGE: There are provisions for  
7 long-term term use of the AIB in terms of the  
8 sizing of the loading dock and the sizing of the  
9 mechanical systems will accommodate a range of  
10 future programmatic uses, including what was on  
11 the table when we were preparing the master plan,  
12 a potential Latino museum.

13 That has been introduced about three  
14 times now to Congress, and we are neutral but  
15 respectful of that pending legislation.

16 MR. NIEWEG: So my point is not to debate  
17 that existing fact.

18 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Right.

19 MR. NIEWEG: My point is just to say that  
20 elements common to all master plan alternatives  
21 ought to include a substantial explanation in this  
22 long-term master plan.

1           It would seem to me that the very notion  
2 of master planning would include one of any  
3 chattel in that campus has no future use. There's  
4 potential, but it's not determined. In master  
5 planning, you're looking forward and it ought to  
6 be clearer.

7           In any case, whatever the current status  
8 is, which you just explained to me, ought to be  
9 explained to the public under elements common to  
10 all master planning. I will note this in our  
11 written comment.

12           Thank you.

13           MS. KOSTER: I think that was a useful  
14 comment. And also, was there anything else on the  
15 -- just to clarify, on the Hirshhorn wall, that it  
16 is common to all elements. Because I think that  
17 was something that you wanted to confirm.

18           MS. TROWBRIDGE: I think one aspect of  
19 the opening in the west side of the Hirshhorn wall  
20 is that by making that change, we would be able to  
21 eliminate the current accessible ramp, which is  
22 less successful and less universal in its

1 function.

2           And so you could come up through the  
3 Ripley Garden and into the Hirshhorn site. That  
4 way it would be, we think a benefit for  
5 accessibility. And that's probably why it was  
6 given as much credit as a positive impact.

7           MS. KOSTER: But it is common to all of  
8 the --

9           MS. TROWBRIDGE: It is common.

10          MS. KOSTER: -- all of the alternatives  
11 we're talking about.

12          SPEAKER: Right. It is common to all,  
13 but it is not --

14          (Simultaneous discussion)

15          MS. KOSTER: It wasn't as clear as  
16 documented.

17          SPEAKER: -- (inaudible) matrix of what's  
18 common to all.

19          MS. KOSTER: Okay. Thank you.

20          Are there other questions? Yes?

21          MR. MARZELLA: Actually, if you could  
22 just -- I have a point of clarification.

1 MS. KOSTER: Just identify yourself.

2 MR. MARZELLA: I'm Bill Marzella from EHT  
3 Traceries -- contributed to the cultural original  
4 resources components of the EIS. If we could just  
5 go back to slide 40, I think there may be an error  
6 in the traffic which is confusing to some of the  
7 commentaries.

8 So the Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden walls -  
9 - this actually addresses the in-kind  
10 rehabilitation of the Sculpture Garden walls. The  
11 opening in the west side is actually a common to  
12 all action alternative as was described, because  
13 Alternative D includes the removal of substantial  
14 portions of that wall.

15 And so the beneficial long-term impacts  
16 that are described here and are common to all  
17 alternative are actually the - in-kind renovation  
18 or rehabilitation of the Hirshhorn Building and  
19 the Sculpture Garden walls.

20 The common to all alternatives does not  
21 address an opening in the west-side, as shown  
22 here. So that's an error. But we'll see in

1 Alternative B if that is addressed as an adverse  
2 effect.

3 MS. KOSTER: B or D?

4 MR. MARZELLA: B and F.

5 MS. KOSTER: B and F.

6 MR. NIEWEG: So page 38, common to all  
7 above grade impacts, demolition -- it's showing  
8 demolition of the west -- this is a graphic error.

9 MR. COAKLEY: I think a way to clarify  
10 that is the extents of that demolition vary, but  
11 there is a demolition of the Hirshhorn wall in all  
12 of the alternatives. It's just the extents of it  
13 vary.

14 MR. MARZELLA: And those were addressed  
15 separately by alternative?

16 (No response heard)

17 MR. MARZELLA: So you're saying, for  
18 example, in Alternative B, that that is addressed  
19 as an adverse impact.

20 MS. KOSTER: So to recap at that, all of  
21 the build alternatives have some demolition  
22 proposed to the Hirshhorn wall, but there is a

1 degree between the three different alternatives.

2           And your suggestion, I believe, is to  
3 clarify that as we go through the process and  
4 better describe that. So I think that was an  
5 extremely helpful comment. And did you have  
6 something?

7           SPEAKER: The graphic shows demolition on  
8 all and the matrix doesn't reflect that.

9           MS. KOSTER: Thank you.

10           (Discussion off the record)

11           MR. ROGERS: Hi. Good morning. Jonathan  
12 Rogers with District Department of Transportation.

13           Not so much a question, but a comment  
14 about the common element of all the build  
15 alternatives, which is the consolidation of the  
16 loading facilities close to 12th Street. We've  
17 had a lot of coordination over the last several  
18 years on this project, and throughout that  
19 coordination, DDOT has noted that the proposed  
20 curb cut adjacent to 12th Street does not meet  
21 DDOT standards.

22           And we have suggested a few options for

1 kind of progressing through the EIS process for  
2 that one which would be to include a build  
3 alternative that did not including the  
4 consolidated loading facility or alternatively, to  
5 go through the public space permitting process to  
6 secure the permits that you would need in order to  
7 be able to have confidence that the loading  
8 facilities could be consolidated with the curb cut  
9 at 12th Street.

10           And so to -- none of those have happened.  
11 All of the build alternatives include consolidated  
12 living facilities and the applicant has not  
13 engaged in the public space permitting process.

14           And so just a note that until you have  
15 approval for your curb cut for that facility,  
16 there's no guarantee that --

17           MS. TROWBRIDGE: How about pending  
18 application for that public space? As I think  
19 you're probably aware and we'll be appearing in  
20 January for that.

21           MR. ROGERS: So I guess then, the  
22 question would be one of timing. If there's a

1 major question mark out there until January, and  
2 you know, this has been a long time in the making  
3 or sort of -- would have preferred that the curb  
4 cut issue would have been resolved before it got  
5 even to this EIS stage.

6 But there is a timing question that is  
7 out there, and until such time that you have a  
8 permit in hand, the ability to combine the loading  
9 facilities, which is the, you know, background of  
10 all of the build alternatives is a question mark.

11 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Yes, we realize that.  
12 Yes.

13 MS. KOSTER: Thank you.

14 MS. BATCHELER: Sorry, just a -- does  
15 that end up then folding into the public review?  
16 Or how will you fold it?

17 Because the public comment period goes  
18 until January 16th, so will you be able to fold it  
19 in in time?

20 MR. ROGERS: Yes. Yes, that will be part  
21 of the review.

22 MS. BATCHELER: Okay.



1           MR. ROGERS: But the public space  
2 committee hearing is not until after January 16th,  
3 so there won't be closure to --

4           MR. FLIS: But any feedback that they  
5 receive at that time, would that be folded in --

6           (Simultaneous discussion)

7           MR. ROGERS: Right.

8           MS. TROWBRIDGE: In the final --

9           MR. ROGERS: -- when the EIS is  
10 advanced. Yes.

11          MS. TROWBRIDGE: Exactly.

12          MR. ROGERS: And that -- I mean, I'm  
13 sorry. It assumes -- there's an assumption that's  
14 been noted -- it assumes a favorable outcome from  
15 the public space permitting process. If there are  
16 issues raised with the notion of a curb cut in  
17 that location, then that obviously has major  
18 impacts for all of the alternatives.

19          You know, I think there has been a  
20 considerable amount of coordination and I think  
21 the outfit has made -- is making the best case  
22 that they can to testify to that curb cut.

1           But again, until such time that there is  
2 the permit, it's an open question.

3           SPEAKER: Yes. Right.

4           MS. TROWBRIDGE: The impact of no action  
5 which would result from a disapproval of that  
6 loading dock is being analyzed in this EIS. So we  
7 are covered for that eventuality if we are not  
8 able to move that loading dock.

9           (Simultaneous discussion)

10          MS. KOSTER: Did you have a --

11          MR. LUEBKE: Yeah, I do have a question.

12          MS. KOSTER: Yes. Okay.

13          MR. LUEBKE: It's under the common to all  
14 thing.

15          MS. KOSTER: Okay.

16          MR. LUEBKE: This really -- we've been  
17 talking about this project for two and a half  
18 years or something.

19                 There was a lot of discussion up front  
20 about the extent of excavation under the Castle,  
21 and that has been, I think, reduced considerably.  
22 I had remembered, and I may be wrong, that option

1 F did not necessarily include --

2 In the common to all narrative, it said  
3 that all of them get 30 foot -- every scheme does  
4 30 feet of excavation under the main level of the  
5 Castle with base isolation, et cetera.

6 I had not understood that that was  
7 actually being carried for all of the options. It  
8 certainly isn't indicated graphically. It isn't  
9 listed. So I -- maybe you can enlighten me.

10 I had thought that in one scheme, it was  
11 literally just lowering the floor by five feet and  
12 30 --

13 (Simultaneous discussion)

14 MS. KOSTER: What I would actually like  
15 to suggest is we still need to go through the  
16 alternatives.

17 MR. LUEBKE: Okay.

18 MS. KOSTER: And it needs -- there will  
19 be a discussion --

20 MR. LUEBKE: Okay, okay.

21 MS. KOSTER: So --

22 MR. LUEBKE: You've got set up as it's

1 common to all.

2 MS. KOSTER: Okay.

3 MR. LUEBKE: So I want to make this point  
4 right now.

5 MS. KOSTER: All right.

6 MR. LUEBKE: It's saying that it's common  
7 to all. It's not showing graphically.

8 MS. KOSTER: That's true.

9 MR. LUEBKE: The only image which has  
10 anything about it is Alternative B, spread below.  
11 It's the only one that seems to indicate stuff  
12 below grade under the Castle.

13 It's your document. I'm just trying to  
14 understand.

15 MR. COAKLEY: Tom, great question.

16 You are right. It does note that there  
17 is that amount of excavation, but it doesn't  
18 describe the extents of it, and the extents of  
19 that excavation vary in the different  
20 alternatives.

21 MR. LUEBKE: But in the summary, it was  
22 said that it was 30 feet.

1 MR. COAKLEY: In common to all.

2 MR. LUEBKE: Common to all.

3 (Simultaneous discussion)

4 MR. LUEBKE: That was what you presented.

5 MR. COAKLEY: And I think we'll do a  
6 better job of clarifying that.

7 MR. LUEBKE: Okay.

8 MR. COAKLEY: There's the accompanying  
9 graphics for the other alternatives that show the  
10 extents of it. So in Alternative D, that has a 30  
11 foot excavation under the entire extent, but in  
12 Alternative B and F, it's limited to the west  
13 range --

14 (Simultaneous discussion)

15 MR. LUEBKE: That's fine. It's just --  
16 it's confusing.

17 MR. COAKLEY: I understand. And we'll  
18 say you know, that it's trying to capture the  
19 common to all. I think that's something that we  
20 can refine a bit, but it's the same comment for  
21 the Hirshhorn wall.

22 There is always demolition at the

1 Hirshhorn wall, but the extents vary. And so what  
2 we were showing in our graphics is the demolition  
3 that's common to all of the alternatives.

4           So that's the logic behind it. We're  
5 identifying that there's an action there that's  
6 taking place. And then as we get into each  
7 alternative, we describe them more fully to  
8 explain the extents of it.

9           MS. KOSTER: Okay. I think with that,  
10 we'll move into the discussion of the alternatives  
11 and -- mindful of time.

12           But these comments have been, I think,  
13 extremely useful in helping to identify how we can  
14 make the document clearer. And so we appreciate  
15 that.

16           MR. COAKLEY: So let's start with  
17 Alternative B. So the summary of Alternative B is  
18 we were looking to minimize the amount of change  
19 above grade. So to keep the Haupt Garden and the  
20 campus as much as we can in its existing  
21 condition, but at the same time, making  
22 infrastructural improvements.

1           Now Alternative B has evolved since we  
2 started the public process. Originally, it had  
3 much less infrastructural improvements to it, but  
4 based on comments from the public, we have re-  
5 analyzed this and changes some of its -- some of  
6 the utilities and the infrastructure that are  
7 being improved.

8           So the scope, above grade, as I noted.

9           Loading dock. We will be replacing the  
10 roof of the Haupt Garden, so that will mean the  
11 Haupt Garden will be removed and replaced.

12           New entry locations for the two museum  
13 pavilions that are facing the Mall, so visitors  
14 coming from the Mall will have an understanding  
15 where to enter those two pavilions.

16           Restoration of the Castle. This also  
17 includes a seismic upgrade to it.

18           Removal of a portion of the existing  
19 Hirshhorn wall to allow that east-west  
20 circulation, and accompanying accessible entry at  
21 the Freer to also allow east-west circulation.

22           Removal of the existing Quad loading.

1               Removal of the AIB loading area.

2               Restoration of the Hirshhorn Sculpture  
3   Garden walls and general repair to the Hirshhorn  
4   itself.

5               Below grade: This is where we're talking  
6   about the extents of the new loading area. So  
7   under the comment made about the west range, there  
8   will be excavation in that area. There will also  
9   be the new central utility plant.

10              So this option allows for a central plant  
11   that will survive better energy efficiency, less  
12   carbon emissions as well as better performing  
13   territorial level services to all of the museums.

14              We're also looking at a restoration of  
15   the below grade tunnel from the Hirshhorn  
16   Sculpture Garden to the Hirshhorn Plaza, and in  
17   general, renovation of the Quad area.

18              MR. LUEBKE: Before you -- I'm sorry.

19              Just to clarify about this question,  
20   though. I'm still understanding that there is  
21   demolition, excavation, base isolation proposed  
22   underneath the Castle proper.



1 MR. COAKLEY: Yep.

2 MR. LUEBKE: It's not shown there.

3 MR. COAKLEY: We'll be showing it --

4 (Simultaneous discussion)

5 MR. LUEBKE: It needs to be -- again, you  
6 know, just trying to understand what you're  
7 proposing.

8 MR. COAKLEY: And just so you know, we're  
9 categorizing that as restoration of the Castle.  
10 So doing that seismic -- that seismic base  
11 isolation or of the --

12 (Simultaneous discussion)

13 MR. LUEBKE: No, I would suggest that  
14 it's not restoration. It's actually a new -- it's  
15 a new -- it's below grade. So if the category is  
16 below grade, it's actually not restoring anything.  
17 It's actually putting in something that wasn't  
18 there.

19 MS. KOSTER: Actually, Tom?

20 MR. LUEBKE: So I --

21 MS. KOSTER: Can I just ask you to hold  
22 this till the end?

1           MR. LUEBKE: Well, okay.

2           MS. KOSTER: I would appreciate it.

3 Thank you.

4           MR. LUEBKE: That's fine. But we're just  
5 trying to clarify what's being presented.

6           MS. KOSTER: I understand.

7           MR. COAKLEY: And Tom, just -- we're  
8 noting it as restoration renovation. I should  
9 have been more clear about that.

10          MR. LUEBKE: Okay. We can pick any  
11 category we want.

12          MR. COAKLEY: So then how does this meet  
13 our purpose and need?

14                Sorry, and one other item. We're also  
15 adding a below grade visitor center that's making  
16 that connection between the Quad Building and the  
17 Castle's basement.

18                So we're enhancing the visitor services.  
19 We're gaining additional program space,  
20 consolidated delivery, enhanced utilities.

21                It is not providing more clear  
22 wayfinding, so still, while there's a limited

1 improvement to the reorientation of the museum  
2 pavilion entries, they're not -- they don't have  
3 the so-called door on the mall, so there still  
4 will be limited visitorship, or we're anticipating  
5 visitor -- limited visitorship.

6 Multiple points of entry which could be  
7 difficult to secure. Again, this is the north-  
8 south section.

9 This is what we're proposing under the  
10 Castle. Slight deepening of the basement to  
11 account for the base isolation or for bracing.

12 The visitor center: Retention of the  
13 existing pavilion.

14 Now, in this scheme, we aren't looking to  
15 do major reconfigurations of the Quad area, so  
16 because the museums are being kept in place, we're  
17 going to be keeping that programming, so education  
18 will still be located down at the basement three  
19 level. Offices, inflections are mixed together in  
20 maintaining that loading location.

21 This is a B-1 plan of the Quad. This is  
22 showing that existing arrangement that's

1 supporting the museum pavilions. And while we can  
2 establish a connection between this new visitor  
3 center, it's a securitist (phonetic) rep that  
4 takes you through back of house spaces with  
5 curatorial services as well as offices.

6           It could require multiple points of  
7 security screening because of this arrangement.  
8 Our goal is to have a centralized security  
9 screening point that will allow visitors to visit  
10 all of the museums and visitor centers at the Quad  
11 Castle complex.

12           (Pause)

13           MS. ESTES: So regarding the impacts with  
14 the actions under Alternative B. Impacts on  
15 cultural resources from Alternative B include the  
16 removal of the Ripley Pavilion, the new opening in  
17 the Hirshhorn Plaza walls and minor  
18 reconfiguration of the Haupt Garden.

19           The direct impacts would be minor and  
20 adverse and long-term, and restoring the Hirshhorn  
21 tunnel would have beneficial long-term impacts.  
22 Other areas of potential impact will be further

1 evaluated at the project design.

2           Visual resources for Alternative B will  
3 be impacted by the opening of the Hirshhorn plaza  
4 wall and tunnel opening and the reconfiguration of  
5 the Quadrangle Building and Haupt Garden. These  
6 would have minor to moderate adverse and minor  
7 beneficial impacts.

8           Alternative B would have the smallest  
9 amount of excavation. Excavation under the Castle  
10 would be limited to the west wing for seismic  
11 isolation, the visitor center, control utility  
12 plant and the new central loading dock.

13           Under Alternative B, no changes to the  
14 Sculpture Garden would occur. In addition to the  
15 impacts from the actions common to all  
16 alternative, Alternative B would require more  
17 underpinning for the AIB compared to Alternative B  
18 (sic), but minimizes the excavation of the entire  
19 campus when compared to Alternative B -- D, excuse  
20 me.

21           Alternative B would result in short and  
22 long-term moderate adverse impacts. In addition

1 to the impacts from the actions common to all  
2 alternatives, there would be a minimal consistency  
3 with the comprehensive plan goal of a pedestrian  
4 oriented development that adds vitality and visual  
5 interest to urban areas and minimal consistency  
6 with the Southwest Ecodistrict plan goals for  
7 improved connections to open space.

8           It would be consistent with the  
9 comprehensive plans goals for preserving,  
10 protecting and rehabilitating historic properties,  
11 and would restore and renovate historic buildings  
12 and minimize changes to above ground spaces  
13 consistent with the National Mall Plan's cultural  
14 resource goals.

15           Addition program space and visitor  
16 amenities are consistent with the National Mall  
17 Plan's goal for a civic stage and portions of  
18 visitor experience, but the lack of visibility of  
19 museum entrances and the lack of consolidated  
20 amenities is not in keeping with the National Mall  
21 Plan's goal for improved access and circulation  
22 and improved visitor experience.

1           The result is minor to moderate long-term  
2   adverse, but there are also beneficial impacts.

3           There would be temporary impacts to the  
4   visitor use and experience from construction.  
5   Temporary closures to areas within the South Mall  
6   Campus would impact pedestrians and bicyclists  
7   affecting their ability to travel directly between  
8   memorials and monuments and recreational spots  
9   within the vicinity of the South Mall Campus.

10           The master plan would be completed in  
11   phases to minimize these disturbances. The  
12   overall visitor experience would be improved. A  
13   small opening in the Hirshhorn's west plaza wall  
14   would enhance circulation and restoring the tunnel  
15   would allow visitors to access the Sculpture  
16   Garden and the museum more easily.

17           The removal of the Ripley Pavilion would  
18   better connect the visitor center with the  
19   Quadrangle Building. The relocation of the  
20   African Art and Sackler entrances to the north  
21   would reorient the museums with the Quadrangle  
22   Building, but underground museum spaces would

1 continue to be hidden from the National Mall,  
2 resulting in moderate long-term adverse impacts.

3           As with the impacts from the elements  
4 common to all mast plan alternatives,  
5 construction, demolition, excavation and  
6 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
7 safety from the removal of asbestos and lead-based  
8 paint, which would be short-term. However, no  
9 longer having asbestos and lead-based paint would  
10 have a long-term beneficial impact.

11           Alternative B would not provide adequate  
12 daylight for staff, because there would be no  
13 skylights in the design for the Quad and there  
14 would be less room for security improvements  
15 resulting in minor and adverse long-term impacts.

16           And with all -- here is the impact matrix  
17 with Alternative B. And so any comments on  
18 Alternative B?

19           MS. KOSTER: Tom, I appreciate you're  
20 waiting and I think Aran is set up to answer your  
21 question regarding the excavation.

22           (Pause)



1                   (Discussion off the record)

2                   MR. LUEBKE: The plan -- if you go to the  
3 plan of the B-1, it doesn't show the extent of  
4 excavation under the main building. It's purple.  
5 Violet or something.

6                   (Simultaneous discussion)

7                   MR. LUEBKE: Oh, I'm sorry.

8                   (Discussion off the record)

9                   MR. COAKLEY: So I think your question  
10 was about the extents of those excavations.

11                   I think we were trying to describe that  
12 we're not sure which seismic upgrade system that  
13 we were going ahead with, so right now, we're in a  
14 study of whether it's base isolation or whether  
15 it's traditional brace framing.

16                   Brace framing system? We don't know if  
17 we're going to excavate that down. So what we're  
18 showing you is where we know we need to make  
19 programmatic improvements, and that's of the  
20 loading dock area.

21                   So you know, we have to describe what we  
22 know, but we're showing you what our plan is. If

1 we do move ahead with base isolation, yes, we  
2 would be doing excavation of about five feet under  
3 that Castle area, but that's not a known at this  
4 point.

5 MR. LUEBKE: Except that -- go to the  
6 section. It shows excavation 30 feet where it  
7 says visitor center, and there's something in the  
8 plan that also shows an extent.

9 There was a plan that -- below grade plan  
10 that shows a tremendous area that would be  
11 programmed, presumably --

12 (Simultaneous discussion)

13 MR. COAKLEY: I think that's -- are you  
14 referring to --

15 MR. LUEBKE: It was a plan -- it was not  
16 a -- not a -- just keep going through each --

17 (Simultaneous discussion)

18 MR. COAKLEY: Okay.

19 MR. LUEBKE: I just want to clarify what  
20 -- keep going.

21 MR. COAKLEY: That's the end of it.

22 MR. LUEBKE: That's the end. All right,

1 well maybe it is the one that goes back one. Go  
2 back one.

3 (Discussion off the record)

4 MR. LUEBKE: So that whole area of purple  
5 --

6 MR. COAKLEY: Yes?

7 MR. LUEBKE: -- that's under the central  
8 part of the Castle, is that -- you just said maybe  
9 four or five feet --

10 MR. COAKLEY: Yes. That's correct.

11 MR. LUEBKE: -- or is it --

12 MR. COAKLEY: I'm sorry. This is new  
13 excavation. This is that visitor center.

14 MR. LUEBKE: What about under the Castle?  
15 It's --

16 MR. COAKLEY: Under the Castle?

17 (Simultaneous discussion)

18 MR. COAKLEY: It could be four to five  
19 feet or it could be nothing, depending on which  
20 seismic upgrade scheme.

21 MR. LUEBKE: But the section -- okay. I  
22 mean, you know -- right away. You know, seismic

1 is -- it has to be done. We all agree. It's just  
2 that it's a kind of a moving target.

3 Sometimes you're saying it applies to all  
4 the traditional base isolation. Now -- and then  
5 you're like well, we're not really sure which  
6 part. Yes, no.

7 (Simultaneous discussion)

8 MR. COAKLEY: It should be -- in all of  
9 them, we're studying whether it's a seismic  
10 upgrade. It could be traditional brace framing or  
11 it could be seismic base isolation.

12 The thought is that seismic base  
13 isolation will limit the amount of bracing that  
14 takes place on the upper floors, which could be a  
15 more sensitive way --

16 MR. LUEBKE: No, we understand the  
17 tradeoff. It's just understanding what you're  
18 proposing (Laughs).

19 MR. COAKLEY: Well, we're in the process  
20 of studying that, so we're just being open with  
21 what we are considering.

22 MS. ESTES: And the impact statement goes

1 through the impacts from it.

2 MS. KOSTER: So this is next. I believe  
3 the impact statement itself covers those different  
4 alternatives in the impacts based on that. So at  
5 the master plan level, this is providing kind of a  
6 full look at the analyses that then as we go into  
7 more detailed development will be addressed.

8 MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

9 MS. KOSTER: Okay. Yes? I just wanted  
10 to make sure. I thought there was a hand up over  
11 there, but I think you're next.

12 MS. BATCHELER: Okay. So I think it  
13 would be helpful, because the graphics are so  
14 accessible compared to the document itself,  
15 especially if we're presenting it to the public.

16 I think it would be really helpful if you  
17 could indicate in some way that this is a  
18 potential, because I assume you're not going to  
19 have an answer on this before January 16th.

20 MR. COAKLEY: No.

21 MS. BATCHELER: Okay.

22 MR. COAKLEY: That's an ongoing study.

1 MS. BATCHELER: Right, right. Exactly.

2 So I think you need to identify as a  
3 potential adverse depending on what happens, and  
4 do that in the graphics as well as in the  
5 documents --

6 MR. COAKLEY: Okay.

7 MS. BATCHELER: -- and then people can  
8 understand that.

9 And then the other thing is that with the  
10 excavation for the visitor center, there would, of  
11 course, be substantial underpinning or some kind  
12 of restructuring of that south wall of the Castle  
13 just to make it happen.

14 MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

15 MS. BATCHELER: So I think that needs to  
16 be identified in here as a below grade impact on  
17 the Castle.

18 MR. COAKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. BATCHELER: Thank you.

20 MS. KOSTER: Other questions or comments?  
21 I'm just giving it a moment.

22 MR. LUEBKE: One -- just one more

1 question.

2 MS. KOSTER: Sure.

3 MR. LUEBKE: This has to do with the  
4 Ripley Pavilion which I know doesn't have a lot of  
5 --

6 MS. KOSTER: Fans?

7 MR. LUEBKE: -- fans, necessarily. I'm  
8 not necessarily even one of them.

9 It's listed here as no impact for visual  
10 quality which is probably debatable. But my  
11 question is, I can't remember where it stands in  
12 terms of the contributing element to the existing  
13 -- do we -- does it have a --

14 MS. TROWBRIDGE: As part of the  
15 Quadrangle Building, which contributes to the  
16 National Mall, the Ripley entry pavilion is part  
17 of the building.

18 MR. LUEBKE: Okay. So you're basically  
19 saying --

20 (Simultaneous discussion)

21 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Yes, it is part of --

22 MR. LUEBKE: Under the cultural resources

1 category, getting rid of it would be, then, a --  
2 an adverse effect.

3 (Discussion off the record)

4 MR. LUEBKE: For visual quality, it's --

5 MS. TROWBRIDGE: It opens up some  
6 beautiful views, so I think there are tradeoffs  
7 there.

8 MR. LUEBKE: No, I understand.

9 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Yeah.

10 (Discussion off the record)

11 MS. BATCHELER: Also, as a cultural  
12 resource, it's again like the other ones. It  
13 seems like a B negative and then positive on the  
14 visual.

15 MS. KOSTER: Okay. Thank you. Last call  
16 for questions. All right.

17 So now we're going to whirl into the next  
18 alternative?

19 MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

20 MS. KOSTER: Thank you.

21 MR. COAKLEY: So Alternative D -- this is  
22 the scheme that everyone is probably most familiar



1 with, because it was the first scheme that we were  
2 presenting as the master plan, I think that was  
3 initially done in 2014.

4           This was the scheme -- I think its most  
5 identifying feature is that it had the dip and  
6 this dip was an accessible entry into the visitor  
7 center. It's located in front of the Castle.  
8 I'll just describe it.

9           It's again, loading, renovation of the  
10 roof, removal of the existing museum pavilions as  
11 well as its associated infrastructure. These are  
12 skylights in various egress bulkheads.

13           In this scheme, we're also adding the two  
14 entry locations here to the Freer and the AIB to  
15 allow east-west circulation. And you can see on  
16 this scheme, we're also noting the demolition of  
17 the Hirshhorn plaza walls that were meant to open  
18 it to the mall itself.

19           This scheme also included the demolition  
20 of the existing Hirshhorn loading area, a below  
21 grade museum pavilion -- or I'm sorry, below grade  
22 museum gallery for the Hirshhorn indicated here, a

1 greater connection between the B-1 level of the  
2 Hirshhorn to this below grade gallery space for  
3 the museum.

4           And then this scheme also has the full  
5 extent of the excavation that Tom had referred to,  
6 that 30-foot excavation underneath the Castle as  
7 opposed to Alternative B which was noting the  
8 central plant between the AIB and the Hirshhorn.

9           Now, this scheme actually met many of the  
10 purposes and needs of the Smithsonian outline. It  
11 had enhanced ADA accessibility, particularly  
12 because of this access ramp, the landscape grade  
13 ramp down to the new visitor center; enhanced  
14 visitor services; improved circulation and  
15 wayfinding.

16           These relocated pavilions -- we're giving  
17 that door on the mall to museum visitors.  
18 Additional program space. That will be that pan-  
19 institutional events and great hall space that was  
20 discussed earlier. Consolidated delivery,  
21 enhanced utilities. With these skylights, clear  
22 stories improve below grade daylight.

1           Now on the down side of this, the museums  
2 -- I'm sorry, the Haupt Garden did not maintain  
3 that intimate feel that it currently has. It was  
4 more of a park-like condition as opposed to a  
5 garden-like condition.

6           There is the removal of the Renwick Gates  
7 and there is also the change to grade in the  
8 fourth court of the Castle. These were all items  
9 that will be addressed in Alternative F.

10           Again, you can see here, primary visitors  
11 coming in from the mall. These museum pavilions  
12 are providing the digital queue for the visitors  
13 to know where the Sackler and the African Art  
14 Museum are. This is that ramp condition, the dip.

15           (Pause)

16           MR. COAKLEY: And you can see by the  
17 expanded extent of the skylights as well as from  
18 the dip, there's increased daylight into the below  
19 grade conditions improving the visitor's  
20 experience.

21           There is a good connection between the  
22 visitor center and the Castle as well as the Quad;

1 consolidated loading area with a well-planned  
2 collection space acting as the intermediary  
3 between collections and the museums, as well as  
4 the ability to relocate the education center in  
5 the daylight area at the B-1 level.

6 MS. ESTES: Impacts on cultural resources  
7 with Alternative D are the greatest of those  
8 across all of the alternatives. The undertaking  
9 will create major adverse impacts on the Hirshhorn  
10 Museum and Sculpture Garden, the National Mall,  
11 the Smithsonian Quadrangle and the Castle.

12 Similarly, impacts on visual resources  
13 are greatest for Alternative D, primarily  
14 resulting from changes to the Hirshhorn Museum and  
15 Sculpture Garden, the visitor center, entrance to  
16 the Castle and the reconfiguration of the  
17 Quadrangle Building and Haupt Garden. That would  
18 result in minor to major adverse impacts.

19 Alternative D also has the greatest  
20 amount of excavation. Excavation under the entire  
21 footprint of the Castle for seismic isolation, the  
22 central utility plant, the loading facility and

1 the visitor would occur.

2 In addition, excavation under Jefferson  
3 Drive would occur from expanding the tunnel  
4 connection to the Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden,  
5 Alternative D would have short and long-term major  
6 adverse impacts to soils previously disturbed.

7 With Alternative D, the connection to the  
8 Southwest Ecodistrict is strengthened, and this  
9 alternative would increase views to the gardens  
10 from the Castle from outside and is consistent  
11 with the Plan's goals for pedestrian oriented  
12 development and improved connections to public  
13 space.

14 Alternative D would also eliminate the  
15 greatest number of physical and visual barriers  
16 between the National Mall, the South Mall Campus  
17 and the Southwest Ecodistrict promoting the goals  
18 of the comprehensive plan in the Southwest  
19 Ecodistrict.

20 However, it's not fully consistent with  
21 the urban design or historic preservation elements  
22 of the comprehensive plan. Alternative D also

1 includes additional program space and improves  
2 visibility of museum entrances consistent with the  
3 National Mall plan's goals for improved visitor  
4 experience and improved access.

5           There will be temporary impacts to  
6 visitor use and experience from construction.  
7 Temporary closures to areas within the South Mall  
8 Campus would impact pedestrians and bicyclists  
9 similar with Alternative B in the actions common  
10 to all alternatives.

11           The master plan would be completed in  
12 phases to minimize these disturbances, and once  
13 complete the overall visitor experience would be  
14 improved. The Hirshhorn's plaza walls would be  
15 removed which would enhance circulation.

16           The tunnel would be opened and expanded  
17 allowing visitors to access the Sculpture Garden  
18 and the museum more easily. Removal of the  
19 galleries would provide space for large  
20 exhibitions.

21           The removal of the Ripley, African Art  
22 and Sackler Pavilions would better connect the

1 visitor center with the Quad and provide better  
2 visibility to the National Mall. The Haupt Garden  
3 would be expanded to improve circulation and to  
4 provide day lighting. These changes would provide  
5 moderate long-term beneficial impacts to visitor  
6 use and experience.

7           As with the impacts from the elements  
8 common to all master plan alternatives,  
9 construction, demolition, excavation and  
10 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
11 safety from the removal of asbestos and lead-based  
12 paint, which would be short-term. However, no  
13 longer having asbestos and lead-based paint  
14 present would have long-term beneficial impacts.

15           Alternative D would provide adequate  
16 daylight for staff and has the advantage of  
17 consolidating entry locations throughout the  
18 National Mall -- South Mall Campus, thereby having  
19 the potential for increased security resulting in  
20 direct long-term moderate beneficial impacts.

21           And here is the impact matrix for the  
22 actions for Alternative D. And are there any

1     comments on Alternative D?

2             MS. KOSTER:   Just following up on the  
3     comments on Alternative D.   Any questions?

4             (No response heard)

5             MS. KOSTER:   Not seeing any -- many no's  
6     in the audience, so -- but I'll give it just  
7     another minute.

8             Okay.   I think we're ready to move on to  
9     the last of the alternatives.

10            MR. COAKLEY:   So we're going to discuss  
11    the summary of Alternative F.

12            What distinguishes F from D?   One of the  
13    prime elements that distinguishes F from D is a  
14    level grade at the fore court of the Castle.   We  
15    are no longer looking at doing an accessible dip  
16    in this location.

17            Instead, we are looking at providing  
18    accessible entry into the below grade visitor  
19    center through elevators located in the museum  
20    pavilions and within the Castle itself.

21            But this does contain the skylights that  
22    bring daylight as well as a series of access



1 stairs to bring visitors down. This alternative  
2 also includes character elements that are  
3 currently found in the Haupt Garden; for instance,  
4 the intimate garden spaces, the meandering  
5 walkways as well as a parterre.

6           So the major elements similar to  
7 Alternative D, loading area, relocated museum  
8 pavilions, a reconfiguration of the Hirshhorn  
9 Sculpture Garden entries as well as a restoration  
10 of the Castle.

11           Below grade is where the greatest  
12 differences are. As you can see here, we're not  
13 looking to do the extensive excavation under the  
14 Castle. Instead, we are looking to excavate in  
15 areas that are previously unoccupied so that the  
16 space in between the AIB and the existing Quad  
17 Building. The scheme also includes the expanded  
18 gallery space below the Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden  
19 as well as the connection to the Hirshhorn  
20 basement level.

21           And we're also looking to maintain the  
22 existing Hirshhorn loading as well as having the

1 loading at the 12th Street condition.

2           The purpose and need provides ADA  
3 accessibility. Enhanced visitor amenities  
4 improves certain campus circulation. Additional  
5 program space, consolidated delivery, level garden  
6 in front of the Castle. This really allows the  
7 Haupt Garden to act as the link between the mall  
8 and the waterfront district through the Southwest  
9 Ecodistrict.

10           Again, showing the section through this  
11 scheme. No dip, just a series of access stairs  
12 that takes you down, so maintaining that level  
13 condition, but will also provide a museum pavilion  
14 that's got a door on the mall.

15           Again, like F, F like D, it provides  
16 daylight to the Quadrangle complex. It also  
17 allows for the reconfiguration of the below grade  
18 space moving education up to the B-1 level,  
19 allowing a visitor center that's connecting both  
20 the Quad and the museums to the Castle itself,  
21 consolidating office spaces as well as providing  
22 museum quality exhibition spaces.

1           You can see this is the B-1 plan of the  
2 proposed scheme. This is the new visitor center.  
3 This is that main entry stair. This entry stair  
4 will allow consolidated screening from this  
5 location.

6           Visitors can move to either museum  
7 without having to go through security screening  
8 again, as well as moving into the visitor center  
9 itself.

10           (Pause)

11           MS. ESTES: Impacts on cultural resources  
12 in Alternative F are similar to those to this --  
13 as described in Alternative D. However, it's  
14 important to emphasize that the impacts to the  
15 National Mall, Quadrangle, Haupt Garden and the  
16 Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden have  
17 minimized by reducing the degree of intervention  
18 which would result in minor to major long-term  
19 adverse impacts.

20           Impacts on visual resources in  
21 Alternative F include those on the Quadrangle, the  
22 8th and 10th Street view sheds, the Hirshhorn

1 Sculpture Garden and the National Mall.

2           Those on the Haupt Garden and the  
3 Hirshhorn Museum have been minimized by reducing  
4 the degree of intervention. The impacts would be  
5 minor to moderate and adverse. Beneficial  
6 impacts, however, would also occur.

7           With Alternative F, there would be a  
8 moderate amount of excavation. Excavation under  
9 the Castle for seismic isolation, the central  
10 utility plant, the loading facility and the  
11 visitor center would be the same as Alternative B.

12           However, as with Alternative D, there  
13 would be some excavation under Jefferson Drive for  
14 expanding the tunnel connection to the Hirshhorn  
15 Sculpture Garden. Similar to Alternative B,  
16 Alternative F would require more excavation and  
17 underpinning for the AIB compared to Alternative  
18 D. However, it minimizes excavation underneath  
19 the Castle.

20           Impacts would be the same as Alternative  
21 B which would result in short-term and long-term  
22 moderate adverse impacts.

1           Like Alternative D, Alternative F  
2 strengthens the concept to the Southwest  
3 Ecodistrict and increases views to the gardens and  
4 the Castle from outside the South Mall Campus,  
5 which is consistent with the goals of the  
6 Southwest Ecodistrict and the comprehensive plan  
7 for a pedestrian oriented development and improved  
8 connections to public space.

9           Alternative F is more consistent with  
10 urban design and historic preservation elements of  
11 the comprehensive plan and is consistent with the  
12 National Mall plan.

13           There will be temporary impacts to  
14 visitor use and experience from construction.  
15 Like Alternatives B and D, there will be temporary  
16 closures to areas within the South Mall Campus  
17 which would impact pedestrians and bicyclists.

18           The master plan would be completed in  
19 phases, though, to minimize these disturbances.  
20 Once complete, the overall visitor experience  
21 would be improved and visitorship would be  
22 increased.

1           Like Alternative B, a small opening in  
2 the Hirshhorn's west plaza wall would enhance  
3 circulation. The tunnel would be opened and  
4 expanded allowing visitors to access the sculpture  
5 garden and the museum more easily.

6           Like Alternative D, new below grade  
7 galleries would provide space for large  
8 exhibitions, and like Alternative D, the removal  
9 of the Ripley, African Art and Sackler pavilions  
10 would better connect the visitor center with the  
11 Quadrangle Building and provide better visibility  
12 to the National Mall.

13           The Haupt Garden would retain its grade  
14 and the parterre would be kept. It would be  
15 expanded to improve circulation and to provide day  
16 lighting. The garden would also incorporate  
17 intimate and teaching gardens. These changes  
18 would provide major long-term beneficial impacts  
19 to visitor use and experience.

20           The impacts to human health and safety  
21 are the same as those for Alternative D.  
22 Construction, demolition, excavation and

1 renovation would adversely impact human health and  
2 safety from the removal of asbestos, but as  
3 previously mentioned, having asbestos and lead-  
4 based paint removed would result in long-term  
5 beneficial impacts.

6           Alternative F would provide adequate  
7 daylight for staff and has the advantage of  
8 consolidating entry locations throughout the South  
9 Mall Campus, thereby having the potential for  
10 increased security. This would result in direct  
11 long-term moderate beneficial impacts.

12           And again, here is the impact matrix for  
13 Alternative F. And comments on Alternative F?

14           MS. KOSTER: I think I'll also say that  
15 we can talk about F, let's say, towards the end of  
16 the meeting.

17           So if there are comments regarding all of  
18 this, it's a great time to bring them up, but  
19 let's go ahead and start -- I think you have the  
20 comment first, Rob, and then we'll come over to  
21 you.

22           MR. NIEWEG: Thank you. Rob Nieweg.

1           And first, thank you for this opportunity  
2   to hear more and to learn more, and we will be  
3   submitting written comments.

4           So first, as a general matter, the DEIS,  
5   as far as we can tell, doesn't identify a  
6   preferred alternative, and -- but with -- but we,  
7   I think, know at this hearing, and then also in  
8   email exchange with the Smithsonian that the  
9   Smithsonian's preferred alternative is Alternative  
10   F.

11           And I just think it would make it -- we,  
12   the National Trust, thinks it would be -- make it  
13   easier for the public to understand what this  
14   document is seeking to analyze, if the public  
15   could easily understand that Alternative F is the  
16   Smithsonian's preferred alternative, as a general  
17   comment.

18           So first, the Hirshhorn wall small  
19   opening -- it would be helpful -- if there are  
20   various extents being analyzed, it would be  
21   helpful to understand what small means.

22           And then second, again, going back to



1 Arts and Industries, it seems that Alternative F,  
2 the preferred alternative, which will deserve  
3 closer scrutiny should indicate that Alternative  
4 F, in effect, the AIB is not being utilized, and  
5 under the logic so far that we've discussed, that  
6 means a lack of improvement, and therefore, that  
7 non-use equals a major adverse impact.

8           In conversation here, we understand that  
9 under Alternative F, AIB would be used for  
10 temporary exhibits of special events that in  
11 effect, it becomes part of the circulation path.  
12 And I recall from earlier iterations that the AIB  
13 also would be used, in a sense, as a viewing  
14 platform.

15           But here, in all of these plans, it  
16 appears essentially as a blank space. Regular  
17 plans for the other buildings that are all shown  
18 in various colors, but AIB is orphaned in the  
19 middle there.

20           It would be interesting to -- it would be  
21 helpful to understand more about -- under  
22 Alternative F, what is meant by some level of

1 excavation and underpinning for AIB.

2           And then last point, if there is, in the  
3 distant future, some sort of major museum use for  
4 the AIB, would it -- and this is a question that  
5 I'd like to have engaged now -- would it or would  
6 it not require major excavation?

7           In other words, for a 21st century  
8 museum, would that 19th century museum purpose  
9 building be enough for the major museums that are  
10 considering it? Or would it require a significant  
11 underground excavation?

12           And looking at Alternative F in this  
13 DEIS, it doesn't take into account how that major  
14 underground excavation would be coordinated even  
15 in concept with the other major underground  
16 excavations that are on paper here.

17           So just -- and we'll write this, but a  
18 general concern that this major master plan is  
19 going forward without a plan for national historic  
20 landmark. Thank you.

21           MS. TROWBRIDGE: Rob, we appreciate your  
22 sense of concern. We are currently engaged in a

1 campaign to raise a hundred million dollars for  
2 interim use of the AIB for exhibits and public  
3 programs. So that is happening. Those public  
4 programs are happening.

5           And all through this master planning  
6 effort, when we started this, we had the  
7 Presidential Commission report on the Latino  
8 museum, which does provide for a fairly extensive  
9 amount of excavation, as you may be aware out  
10 under the mall.

11           We have not studied that. We have been  
12 waiting for many Congresses for -- whether that  
13 bill would be authorized that would direct the  
14 Smithsonian to engage in a separate study for  
15 purposes of a evaluating that as a separate  
16 project.

17           So we necessarily separated our master  
18 planning project from what we expected to be a  
19 separate feasibility study related to the Latino  
20 museum or other use designated by Congress.

21           That has not happened, but that's how we  
22 had structured the project. And really, given

1   that significant potential national museum as a  
2   potential direction for that building, we really  
3   weren't in a position for designating other uses  
4   for that building. We did accommodate that  
5   potentially in the overall master plan.

6                   (Pause)

7                   MS. PERRY: Hi. Kate Perry, Committee of  
8   100.

9                   I've got three questions. One of them  
10   follows up on what Sarah said or started to say  
11   earlier about a lack of information about a risk  
12   to the historic fabric of the Castle building, and  
13   of course, Arts and Industries -- all of the  
14   different seismic retrofit methodologies.

15                  That's information that the Committee of  
16   100 asked for before. I know you're doing a  
17   study. When is your study going to be finished?

18                  MR. COAKLEY: It's an ongoing study, and  
19   I think -- I'll give an approximate date that it's  
20   taking -- it will take about nine to ten months  
21   for that study to be completed.

22                  MS. PERRY: That would seem to be

1 essential data to the calculus of what we're now  
2 engaged in, considering beneficial versus adverse  
3 impacts. So that's one piece of missing data, I  
4 think.

5 Another piece is that it's an assessment  
6 of the condition of the roof membrane under the  
7 Haupt Garden and the different approaches that  
8 might be considered for addressing the condition.  
9 And you applaud in No-Action Alternative one, or I  
10 guess that's A, that a patching repair job would  
11 suffice.

12 So I think we also should see your  
13 assessment of the condition of the roof membrane  
14 and what the different approaches might be to  
15 addressing that issue.

16 MS. TROWBRIDGE: We did not indicate that  
17 patching ongoing for you know, forever patching of  
18 that roof membrane is the right storage for that  
19 building.

20 (Simultaneous discussion)

21 We have very valuable collections stored  
22 in the Sackler Museum, and the appropriate action

1 for rehabilitation of that kind of a green roof  
2 membrane is that at the end of the lifetime of  
3 that membrane, which are reaching or have reached,  
4 you remove the entire garden and you replace the  
5 membrane.

6 MS. PERRY: Well again, that is not in  
7 the draft EIS and that is also a piece of  
8 information the Committee of 100 asked for. So  
9 that's another thing I would suggest.

10 MS. TROWBRIDGE: I think we have  
11 discussed that.

12 (Simultaneous discussion)

13 MS. TROWBRIDGE: But everywhere can  
14 provide you more --

15 MS. PERRY: That would be good.

16 MS. TROWBRIDGE: -- information on that  
17 evaluation.

18 MR. COAKLEY: I'd like to say that the  
19 draft of EIS section -- what Ann said, that's  
20 exactly what's in there.

21 MS. PERRY: Mm-hmm.

22 MR. COAKLEY: That the roof has reached

1 its intended useful life and it just needs to be  
2 repaired.

3 MS. PERRY: So I guess we'd like to see  
4 an assessment -- the analysis that was undertaken  
5 to show that condition.

6 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Okay. We do reports on  
7 a regular basis on each of our buildings, and I  
8 will find that --

9 MS. PERRY: That would be really helpful.

10 MS. TROWBRIDGE: -- information.

11 We have a roofing specialist who can  
12 provide that for you.

13 MS. PERRY: Great.

14 And just one last question: Three years  
15 ago, when this process started -- I think it was  
16 at the first public meeting, the Smithsonian said  
17 that the projected potential cost of this proposal  
18 of the South Mall Campus master plan was \$2.5  
19 billion.

20 And I'm wondering, what is the update of  
21 that estimate? Here we are three years later.

22 MR. COAKLEY: We are working through the

1 costing of the various alternatives, and we will  
2 be able to provide that at future meetings.

3 MS. PERRY: Future meetings?

4 MR. COAKLEY: Within the next month.

5 MS. PERRY: Month. Great. Thank you  
6 very much.

7 MS. KOSTER: I think, Sarah?

8 MS. BATCHELER: So I think that we can  
9 really appreciate the move toward Alternative F  
10 which clearly has fewer impacts than Alternative  
11 D.

12 There are a couple of things. I don't  
13 want to repeat the comments, but some of the  
14 comments from B and D, also I find in F. And I  
15 assume that you will move those over, like the  
16 Ripley Pavilion and some of that kind of thing --  
17 the underpinning of the Castle for the visitor  
18 center.

19 But there are a couple of other things.  
20 To go back to what Rob was talking about with the  
21 coordination between a potential future museum  
22 project at the A&I Building, that the master plan



1 for Alternative F and for the below grade portion  
2 relies on the connection -- or it doesn't rely on  
3 it for everything.

4           A large part of it is the connection  
5 underground between the Castle piece and the  
6 Hirshhorn piece. And the only place to expand  
7 outward that has been discussed, for potential,  
8 the museum or whatever would go there, is out  
9 under the mall, which would be a conflict with any  
10 loading dock or people moving back and forth  
11 between them.

12           So I think at least in that aspect of it,  
13 you could anticipate that common would accommodate  
14 that movement which you are really -- I mean, you  
15 have it listed as a beneficial impact, that  
16 connection between the different museums.

17           And that would then be -- either prevent  
18 a museum from being able to go there or it would  
19 have to go away for the museum to be entered. So  
20 that's the one I think --

21           (Simultaneous discussion)

22           MS. TROWBRIDGE: Yeah, I think --

1 MS. BATCHELER: -- would be really  
2 helpful.

3 MS. TROWBRIDGE: -- it would be -- we  
4 would have lengthened it if we would have had the  
5 action on the alternatives. I think it may, in  
6 effect, mean a delay in extending that utility  
7 until we have more information.

8 MS. BATCHELER: So maybe in the --

9 MS. TROWBRIDGE: Or a change in its  
10 design to anticipate options.

11 MS. BATCHELER: So I think Bob was asking  
12 for a more detailed explanation of what will be  
13 happening with the A&I Building generally, and  
14 that could be part of that discussion; what parts  
15 of this plan would not be able to have it done  
16 until that was figured out or adjustments that  
17 need to happen.

18 The other comments that have are also  
19 kind of about coordination between the different  
20 documents and focusing on the graphic materials,  
21 because again, there's also -- I think that's more  
22 easy for people to understand.

1           The tunnel under -- the tunnel I was just  
2   talking about that goes under the road is actually  
3   not shown in the - What are these documents? So  
4   just make sure that it's shown on all of the  
5   drawings.

6           MR. COAKLEY: Are you referring to the  
7   tunnel going from Jefferson --

8           MS. BATCHELER: Under the Jefferson  
9   Drive.

10          MR. COAKLEY: -- underneath the -- Under  
11   Jefferson Drive connecting the sculpture garden to  
12   the --

13          MS. BATCHELER: Right. It's shown on  
14   slide 90, but it's not shown wherever it was. I  
15   think it was one of the slides that you had up  
16   here.

17          (Simultaneous discussion)

18          MS. TROWBRIDGE: Maybe the common to all.

19          MS. BATCHELER: Yeah, maybe.

20          MR. COAKLEY: I think the reason why it  
21   wasn't noted in the common to all is because one  
22   is a rest -- looking at B, it's a restoration of

1   that existing tunnel. Well, D and F -- it's an  
2   expansion.

3               MS. BATCHELER: Well, I remember seeing  
4   it under this alternative. I don't remember which  
5   one it was missing from, but it seemed to be  
6   missing.

7               And the other comment is that you should  
8   probably -- for the -- where you have the sections  
9   and the plans, you showed a plan -- the plans you  
10   showed -- in the section, you show those sort of  
11   swoopy shape --

12              MR. COAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

13              MS. BATCHELER: -- and in the plans you  
14   show the boxy --

15              MR. COAKLEY: Yup.

16              MS. BATCHELER: -- sort of shape. But I  
17   need -- just make them missing so you don't  
18   confuse people.

19              MR. COAKLEY: Okay.

20              MS. BATCHELER: If you were just doing a  
21   notation of some kind of pavilion, don't do that.

22              MR. COAKLEY: All right. Point well

1 taken. We were just showing that it could be  
2 various options.

3 MS. BATCHELER: I think that we'll just -  
4 -

5 MR. COAKLEY: We can show that as the  
6 same graphic.

7 MS. BATCHELER: That was it, in addition  
8 to the other comments. The base -- showing the  
9 base isolation and all of that.

10 MR. COAKLEY: Thank you. Great points.

11 (Pause)

12 MS. KOSTER: Tom, yes?

13 MR. LUEBKE: Can you just go back about  
14 --yeah -- see the blue --

15 MS. BATCHELER: That's the one that was  
16 missing.

17 MR. LUEBKE: That's the one. So this is  
18 what I'm trying to understand. You've got the  
19 light blue, which is the excavation.

20 MR. COAKLEY: Yes.

21 MR. LUEBKE: But underneath the Great  
22 Hall in the center part of the Castle, your

1 section shows -- gosh, you know, it looks like it  
2 could go ten feet lower than where it is today.

3           And yet, you're not mentioning anything  
4 about excavation there. You're not mentioning --  
5 it's a little bit of an undefined -- it's still --  
6 honestly, that would be tremendous excavation.  
7 And so I guess in all of these, this particular  
8 diagram, I'm just three times --

9           You're sort of not putting it in the  
10 scope that it would very much have to be a part  
11 of. So I would ask that you -- I think one might  
12 be 50 feet for 45 ED. One might actually be 30.  
13 This one might only be ten?

14           MR. COAKLEY: I think it was  
15 approximately five feet deep.

16           MR. LUEBKE: Can you look at your  
17 section?

18           MS. TROWBRIDGE: But it's also that it's  
19 lower in the Castle basement, so that's --

20           (Simultaneous discussion)

21           MR. LUEBKE: It's all significant.

22           MS. TROWBRIDGE: Yes.

1           MR. LUEBKE:  So I'm just asking you to  
2 just try to --

3           MR. COAKLEY:  Okay.

4           (Simultaneous discussion)

5           MS. TROWBRIDGE:  That would be more  
6 appropriate.  And then we haven't labeled the  
7 amounts.

8           MR. LUEBKE:  Right.  And you may -- I  
9 don't know if it's worth getting into those layers  
10 of information --

11          MS. TROWBRIDGE:  Right.

12          MR. LUEBKE:  -- the information, but --

13          MS. TROWBRIDGE:  No, you're right.

14          (Simultaneous discussion)

15          MR. LUEBKE:  Okay.  Thanks.

16          MS. KOSTER:  Before we get going too far,  
17 because I know you had to wrap up --

18          (Discussion off the record)

19          MS. KOSTER:  But I do want to honor --  
20 because this -- so to go till noon, and we're kind  
21 of right in that area.

22          So we can keep going, but if there are

1 folks that need to leave and have comments or  
2 questions, I just want to make sure we're honoring  
3 your time to ask them here.

4           Okay. We're going to stay with this till  
5 the bitter end. You all gave the thumbs up. All  
6 right.

7           So I think now what we're going to do is  
8 quickly go through a cumulative impact study, and  
9 then we'll recap kind of where we are in terms of  
10 the different processes and your opportunity to  
11 comment on the process.

12           MS. ESTES: So, cumulative impact is the  
13 implemental impact of the alternatives on -- with  
14 past projects, present projects and future  
15 projects.

16           So with the No-Action Alternative with  
17 regard to cultural resources, the No-Action  
18 Alternative would contribute to the overall  
19 adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources  
20 from the lack of a coordinated approach to the  
21 protection, maintenance and stabilization of  
22 cultural resources.



1           In all of the master plan alternatives,  
2   the degree of change proposed for cultural  
3   resources of the South Mall Campus would have a  
4   major adverse cumulative impact.

5           With Alternative B, in addition to the  
6   actions common to all master plan alternatives,  
7   this would contribute to an overall moderate  
8   adverse cumulative impact.

9           The cumulative impacts associated with  
10   Alternative D would be similar to those discussed  
11   under Alternative B. However, they would be more  
12   intensified due to the greater degree of change to  
13   the overall site and change in grade.

14           Similarly, with cumulative impacts  
15   associated with Alternative F, would be similar to  
16   those under Alternative B, but more intensified  
17   due to the degree of change to the overall site.  
18   However, this impact would be slightly less than  
19   with Alternative D, because F maintains the  
20   existing plane of the Quadrangle and the Haupt  
21   Garden.

22           The lack of a coordinated approach to the

1 protection, maintenance and stabilization of  
2 cultural resources under the No-Action Alternative  
3 would result in long-term adverse cumulative  
4 impacts to the views and vistas surrounding the  
5 South Mall Campus.

6           The master plan alternatives would  
7 contribute to the long-term adverse impacts to  
8 these views and vistas. The grade of degree of  
9 change would be most intensified under  
10 Alternatives D and F. The altering of the  
11 existing grade of the Haupt Garden and the  
12 Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden under Alternatives D  
13 and F would create an adverse cumulative impact to  
14 these landscapes.

15           The South Mall Campus could potentially  
16 contribute to short-term indirect adverse  
17 cumulative impacts to soils due to the increased  
18 soil erosion during construction.

19           Because the District of Columbia is  
20 already an intensive developed urban area, the  
21 overall long-term adverse cumulative impact would  
22 be negligible. The impacts of the proposed

1 seismic improvements would be localized to the  
2 South Mall Campus. No cumulative impacts would  
3 result.

4           The South Mall Campus master plan could  
5 potentially contribute to short-term indirect  
6 adverse cumulative impacts to storm water due to  
7 increased soil erosion during construction  
8 activities in the area.

9           The South Mall Campus master plan would  
10 contribute to the indirect long-term major  
11 beneficial cumulative impacts to storm water in  
12 the district by retaining storm water on-site to  
13 the maximum extent practical.

14           Construction of present and future  
15 projects near the South Mall Campus would generate  
16 fugitive dust, and emissions from construction  
17 activities and equipment resulting in a cumulative  
18 short-term adverse impact air quality.

19           The installation or gradual replacement  
20 of mechanical systems with new efficient units in  
21 existing buildings would reduce the potential  
22 effect new source of emissions would have on air

1 quality, resulting in long-term beneficial  
2 cumulative impacts.

3           The South Mall Campus master plan in  
4 combination with other plans will result in long-  
5 term beneficial cumulative impacts as buildings  
6 are upgraded by decreasing cumulative energy use  
7 and improving the way energy is produced, thereby  
8 decreasing their contribution to localized  
9 emissions.

10           Construction of present and future  
11 projects would cause an increase in traffic on the  
12 local roadway network. The master plan, in  
13 combination with these projects would add slightly  
14 to the overall adverse cumulative impact.

15           The South Mall Campus master plan in  
16 combination with other plans would result in long-  
17 term beneficial impacts as buildings and  
18 facilities are upgraded by decreasing the amount  
19 of energy used and improving the way energy is  
20 produced, thereby decreasing their contribution to  
21 localized additions.

22           By enhancing walkability, removing

1 physical and visual barriers and extending the  
2 civic qualities of the National Mall to the south,  
3 the South Mall Campus master plan would contribute  
4 to the goals common with other planning efforts in  
5 the area resulting in moderate long-term  
6 beneficial cumulative impacts.

7           The various phases of the master plan  
8 would affect the human health and safety of the  
9 South Mall Campus. Construction could occur at  
10 the same time from other projects which would  
11 result in short-term adverse cumulative impacts.

12           The overall cumulative impact of projects  
13 and planning efforts in the area would be long-  
14 term and beneficial to human health and safety.

15           The various phases of the master plan  
16 could disrupt utilities of neighboring properties  
17 of the South Mall Campus. Construction of present  
18 and future projects could occur at the same time  
19 resulting in short-term adverse cumulative  
20 impacts.

21           All of the present projects and planning  
22 efforts in combination with the master plan would

1 ultimately reduce demand for energy and water  
2 supplies and lessen the burden on utility  
3 providers in the region, resulting in beneficial  
4 impacts to utilities.

5           The construction waste generated out of  
6 the master plan alternatives would contribute to  
7 short-term and long-term adverse cumulative  
8 impacts of construction waste, but the additional  
9 impacts would be negligible compared to the  
10 overall volume of waste generated in the area.

11           The overall cumulative impacts to waste  
12 management from present and reasonably foreseeable  
13 future actions would be long-term and beneficial.  
14 The South Mall Campus would contribute to these  
15 beneficial impacts.

16           (Pause)

17           MS. ESTES: Do you want me just to go  
18 ahead with the other --

19           So I'm going to just go ahead and  
20 summarize the next steps for the EIS, so we are  
21 aware. We're currently in the public review of  
22 the draft and regular impact statement which will

1 continue until January 16th. And that's a 60-day  
2 review. We provided comment forms out in the  
3 lobby, if you would like to use those, as well.

4           And again, we've had two public hearings.  
5 We had one last Monday and we're having this one  
6 today, and we are going for the concept master  
7 plan approval at the January 4th hearing within  
8 CPC. And the concept master plan presentation to  
9 the Commission of Fine Arts will be on January  
10 18th.

11           We will also, as previously mentioned, be  
12 presenting to the District Department of  
13 Transportation's public space committee. We are  
14 anticipating a consulting parties meeting which  
15 would be the 10th consulting parties meeting, and  
16 this would be on the programmatic agreement, and  
17 that would be probably in late January or early  
18 February. So be on the look out for an invitation  
19 to that.

20           And then we will be taking the comments  
21 received today as well as those written comments  
22 that we've received and we will be analyzing

1 those, looking at those and publishing a final  
2 environmental impact statement, and that is  
3 scheduled to be released around March 14th, and  
4 that would be -- provide another 30-day comment  
5 period.

6           And the Smithsonian is looking to have a  
7 preliminary master plan before the National  
8 Capital Planning Commission in March of 2018 with  
9 the final master plan being heard in May of 2018.  
10 And then following that would be the record of  
11 decision on the Environmental Impact Statement in  
12 June of next year.

13           And again, these are the various ways to  
14 comment. You can submit your comments to NCPC  
15 directly to the Smithsonian. You can submit them  
16 by email, also.

17           And we are accepting comments through  
18 January 16th. These addresses and the email  
19 address are provided on the comment card out in  
20 the lobby.

21           So with that, does anybody have any final  
22 comments?



1                   (No response heard)

2                   MS. KOSTER: So first of all, any last  
3 questions about the comment process? There's a  
4 lot of moving parts to this, so if you're  
5 following it, you're doing really well (Laughter).

6                   And I, on behalf of both the National  
7 Capital Planning Commission and the Smithsonian  
8 would like to thank you all for being here. I  
9 think I certainly have found that your comments  
10 were helpful in pointing out what can help make  
11 this, very complex project to the alternatives,  
12 clearer and more understandable, because it is a  
13 very complex project. And every time I listened  
14 to this presentation, I felt one more thing.

15                  So again, there are lots of different  
16 opportunities to comment on this project for the  
17 draft EIS. The comment due date is January 16th.  
18 If you have any questions between then and now,  
19 please feel free to let our contacts at NCPC or  
20 the Smithsonian, Matt Flis or Michelle Spofford  
21 know about that.

22                  And again, thank you. Have a very safe

1 and happy holiday season.

2 [Whereupon, the public meeting was  
3 adjourned.]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

2

3 I, Jill Cohen-Wilson, do hereby certify that the  
4 foregoing proceeding was transcribed from a  
5 digital audio recording provided to me by Olender  
6 Reporting and thereafter was reduced to  
7 typewriting by me or under my direction.

8

9 I am not related to any of the parties in this  
10 matter, and this transcript is a true and accurate  
11 record of said audio recording to the best of my  
12 ability. The above information has been  
13 transcribed by me with a pledge of confidence, and  
14 I do hereby certify that I will not discuss or  
15 release the content or any information contained  
16 herein.

17

18

19 Jill Cohen-Wilson,  
20 Legal Transcriptionist

21

22