NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

OPEN SESSION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,
APRIL 5, 2018

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in Room 5115, Suite 500, 401 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, at 1:00 P.M., L. Preston Bryant, Jr., Chairman, presiding.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

L. PRESTON BRYANT, JR., Chairman
Presidential Appointee
EVAN CASH, Office of the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia
ARRINGTON DIXON, Mayoral Appointee
THOMAS GALLAS, Presidential Appointee
PETER MAY, Department of the Interior
KEVIN ORTIZ, U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
MICHAEL L. RHODES, Department of Defense

ERIC SHAW, Office of the Mayor of

the District of Columbia

BETH WHITE, Presidential Appointee

MINA WRIGHT, General Services Administration

NCPC STAFF PRESENT:

MARCEL C. ACOSTA, Executive Director

MATTHEW FLIS, Senior Urban Designer

CARLTON HART, Community Planner

JULIA KOSTER, Secretary to the Commission

VIVIAN LEE, Urban Planner

ANNE SCHUYLER, General Counsel

LEE WEBB, Historic Preservation Specialist

MICHAEL WEIL, Urban Planner

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Report of Chairman 6

Election of Vice Chairman and Appointment of Third Member to the Executive Committee. 8

Report of Executive Director 11

Legislative Update 112

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS 12

National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, National Law Enforcement Museum Streetscape Modifications

United States Department of Defense, Department of the Navy, Joint Base Andrews, New Hangar Facility

Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Rock Creek Stream Valley Park

Events DC, RFK Campus Redevelopment - Multiuse Fields

ACTION ITEMS - WITH PRESENTATIONS

Smithsonian Institution, National Mall South Mall Campus Master Plan. 18

Smithsonian Institution, National Air and Space Museum - Building Exterior, Vestibules and Site Improvements 108

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service - National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial 112

District of Columbia Department of Transportation, Southwest and Southeast Quadrants of the District of Columbia from I-295 Suitland Parkway Interchange to P Street, Washington, DC - South Capitol Street Corridor and Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge 162

Events DC - Walter E. Washington Convention Center Exterior Alterations and Streetscape Improvements Storm and Desert Shield Memorial 217

United States Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology - Draft Gaithersburg Campus Master Plan Storm and Desert Shield Memorial 230

Adjournment. 259

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

1:08 p.m.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Good afternoon and welcome to the National Capital Planning Commission's April 5, 2018, meeting. And if you would, please, stand with me and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[INSERT - AGENDA]

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you. For all in attendance, please note that today's meeting is being live streamed on the ncpc.gov website. We do have a quorum and so we'll call the meeting to order. And we will proceed per the agenda that has been publicly noticed.

Agenda Item 1 is the Report of the Chairman. And I'll just make a couple of things. But first I'll say that yesterday a number of us were able to spend at least a couple of hours at the NIST campus in Gaithersburg. And we very much appreciate Phil Neuberg and Susan Cantilli for their hospitality.

As you know, on today's agenda is the Master Plan for the NIST campus, which is an almost 600 acre campus and 4,000 employees. It's a well laid out campus. They have a lot of open space.

They do have a number of facilities challenges and so we hope our master planning

efforts will help and support them in that effort. So we very much appreciated our NIST hosts yesterday.

[INSERT - NIST FIELD TRIP DOCUMENTS]

The second thing is I'll note that every April the Commission reaffirms or changes its officers. And this is -- it's hard to believe but I'm in my ninth year. And this is my last year as Chair of the Commission, and my term will expire in January of 2019.

So this year we have to, in anticipation of the transition, in working with the White House and the Office of Personnel in their timely naming of a successor, we were thinking about that as we are doing our election of Vice Chairman and the appointment of an Executive Committee so that we can have as smooth a transition as possible and maintain respect for the Federal District partnership as well that actually works so well.

So with that, that which is up for actual nomination and vote is the office of Vice Chair. And so is there a nomination?

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN AND APPOINTMENT OF THIRD MEMBER TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Yes, Mr. Chair,

I would like to nominate Thomas Gallas to be a Vice Chair consistent with your explanation that we've got to make some particular changes. So I would like to make that motion, please.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved by Commissioner Dixon of the District that Tom Gallas would be the Vice Chair for the upcoming year. Is there a second to that?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The nominations are closed. All in favor of Mr. Gallas being the Vice Chair of the National Capital Planning Commission for a year hence say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Do I get to move my chair so I still sit next to him? He keeps bragging about how he keeps me in line.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: That's true. Somebody has to.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So with that, thank you, Tom. And Tom will ensure that there is federal leadership of a federal agency in the event there is not a timely reappointment, which is sometimes the case.

So then, as the Chair's prerogative, although I seek your consent, the appointment of the Executive Committee. And so the Chair and the Vice Chair are automatically on the Executive Committee.

And so I would like to keep Mr. Dixon as the District representative on the Executive Committee. He's currently on the Executive Committee. So I don't see an objection to that. There's a head nod.

And so I would like to thank Mr. May for his service on the Executive Committee. And just so you know, the Executive Committee, it's principle activity is to set the agenda for each meeting. It's not much more than that. And so it consists of about a very exciting five minute call once a month. And so, but thank you for

that. Thank you, Mr. May.

Agenda Item Number 2 is the Report of Executive Director, Mr. Acosta.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MR. ACOSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have two quick announcements to make. First, we are holding two open houses for the public to learn more about the update to the Comprehensive Plan's Park and Open Space Element, which the Commission authorized last month.

The first open house will take place on Wednesday, April 11, from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. and the second will take place on Thursday, April 12, from 10:30 a.m. through noon. Both open houses will be held here at the NCPC offices.

Also, we're accepting public comments through May 7 of next month. And you can find more information as well as download the document on our website.

Finally, I would also like to note that urban planner Stacy Woods retired from the agency last month. Stacy spent 17 years at NCPC

and most recently worked on the Federal Capital Improvements Program. And we wish Stacy all the best in his retirement. That's it.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Any questions for Mr. Acosta? Agenda Item Number 3 is the legislative update. Ms. Schuyler?

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

MS. SCHUYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have nothing to report.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Excellent.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

And Agenda Item Number 4 is the Consent Calendar, and we have four items on the Consent Calendar. Item 4A is the approval of the preliminary site development plans for the streetscape improvements of the National Law Enforcement Museum. And that's brought to us by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund.

[INSERT - NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 4B is the final site and building plans for a hangar facility at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland. And that is brought to us by the Department of Navy.

[INSERT - NEW HANGAR FACILITY]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Item 4C is for a preliminary and final site development plan approval for the Beach Drive replacement in Maryland submitted by the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

[BEACH DRIVE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: And last, Agenda Item 4D, is for preliminary site and building plans for multiuse fields at RFK Stadium as part of that redevelopment. Are there any questions on the Consent Calendar?

[INSERT - RFK CAMPUS REDEVELOPMENT]

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Chairman, I would like move the Consent Calendar and with a comment that I'm glad to hear the golf course is still going to keep its hole, but they will be realigned temporarily.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Right.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. I'm sorry, Mr. May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It's been moved and seconded, but I just have a comment. So on the last item, RFK Playing Fields, I just want to express how excited I am that after many years of too much asphalt at the RFK grounds, there are actually going to be some playing fields for the benefit of the District and broader community.

And so it's been a long time coming. I'm really happy that Events DC is in a position to move forward with it in spite of the fact that they only have 19 years and 300 days or so on their lease so. But anyway, it's a very positive

thing. So I'm very happy it's happened.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Excellent. So the Consent Calendar has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on any item? Hearing none, all in favor of the Consent Calendar say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed no.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The vote carries. So now we'll go into the open session agenda. And I'll note that we have a big agenda. We have numerous items that are important and significant.

All will require a good deliberation and discussion. Not every item will require as much discussion as others. So the length of today's meeting is entirely within your hands.

So Agenda item -- and I do have a 6 o'clock train.

ACTION ITEMS WITH PRESENTATION

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SOUTH MALL CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 5A is approval of comments on the draft Master Plan for the Smithsonian Institution South Mall Campus Master Plan. The Commission provided comments on the concept at our January 2018 meeting. And so first we have Mr. Flis and then we have Mr. Horvath. And so Mr. Flis, welcome.

MR. FLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. As you had mentioned, the Smithsonian Institution has submitted the draft South Mall Campus Master Plan for your review and comment.

The Smithsonian does propose the Master Plan to meet its long-term space requirements and to address physical and operational deficiencies across the campus that impact the visitor use and experience as well the Smithsonian's ability to effectively and safely implement its programs.

The draft Master Plan is here before you today with additional information that was

prepared in response to your previous comments.

The Master Plan is intended to be a guide for the campus over the next 20 to 30 years and, as with other Master Plans which you have reviewed, the Plan will identify projects to be implemented over time as funding becomes available.

Individual projects will require review and approval by the Commission. And while throughout the Master Plan you will see conceptual renderings and graphics of the proposed improvements, the specific designs will be developed at the individual project stage.

So just as a reminder, the project area is located along the south side of the National Mall between 7th Street and 12th Street and between Independence Avenue to the south and Jefferson Drive to the north.

The site is a combination of important historic and cultural facilities, which form the centerpiece of the Smithsonian Institution on approximately 17 acres.

The campus also falls within the National Mall Historic District. And here on the screen in front you can see the Castle, Freer Gallery, Arts and Industries Building and the Hirshhorn Gallery within the context of the city.

And here you can see the existing site plan, again with Independence Avenue to the south and then Jefferson Drive and the National Mall to the north.

Overall, the Master Plan seeks to guide development of the South Mall while addressing a number of needs across the campus. These include restoring historic buildings, improving accessibility and connectivity, enhancing visibility of the below grade museums and services and enhancing visitor amenities, modernizing loading, improving security and sustainability, all while enhancing the museums and the core services of the Smithsonian.

These goals are generally consistent with many of the policies set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and as such, staff recommends

the Commission support the goals of the Master Plan.

The Smithsonian has made it clear that the Castle is critically important and so are the other three National Register listed buildings, including the Freer Gallery, Arts and Industries Building and the Hirshhorn.

These priorities have influenced the decision-making process in developing the Master Plan and have also influenced decisions about where change is most appropriate.

So before I go on into the details of the draft Master Plan, it may be helpful to understand where the planning process has been.

This effort began back in 2012 with work at the Smithsonian, who identified comprehensive goals and priorities for the campus. These goals were developed after significant internal discussion among the numerous Smithsonian stakeholders, including the museums themselves. And these are captured on the screen in front of you.

Subsequently in 2014, the Smithsonian released its initial concept of the Master Plan. This scheme included a dramatic dip in front of the Castle, as shown here on this image, as well as an open lawn-type space, which would be substantially different from the smaller scale and intimate gardens which one would see there today.

In addition to those changes to the setting of the Castle and the gardens, the Plan also proposed radically changing the Hirshhorn Museum site by removing much of the site walls that are existing today.

Equally significant was a proposal to install an entire sub-basement level under the Castle and also moving Jefferson Drive. Many members of the public responded strongly against some of these proposals, particularly the grand open garden or lawn space and the large dip in the front of the Castle.

So through the review process, the Smithsonian worked to develop additional Master

Plan alternatives beyond that first concept which I just showed.

And these were intended to consider other strategies to meet the Master Plan goals while minimizing impacts. So you can see here on the screen all the alternatives that were developed over the last several years.

A draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, was prepared to evaluate the impacts resulting from the Master Plan. In addition, the Smithsonian also initiated the Section 106 process and has engaged in many meetings with the consulting parties to discuss a significant number of historic resources within the campus.

A final EIS will be prepared and a programmatic agreement developed to include the Section 106 process, with the expectation that the final Master Plan would return to the Commission later in the spring or summer.

The purpose of today's review is to confirm selection of the preferred alternative

and to provide comments that will guide the final Master Plan.

Throughout the comment period, numerous letters and emails were sent along with agency comments on the alternatives. A majority of the public expressed strong support for preserving the gardens in their current condition while others questioned the need to replace the roof. Other comments focused on the future of the Arts and Industries Building and the proposed changes to the Quadrangle pavilions.

In addition to the initial Master Plan concept, which I showed you, which is also known as Alternative D, Alternative B was developed to analyze mostly minimal changes to the campus, but it did not greatly improve the campus functionality nor meet the goals of the Smithsonian.

During the public comment period, many indicated this alternative would be best because of the more limited changes, including retention of the gardens and the pavilions in their current

configuration and condition.

So after further thought and also considering input from the stakeholders, the Smithsonian did create Alternative F as a middle approach, minimizing some of the changes which had raised concerns, but still trying to maximize improvements to the campus function and services.

In this alternative, again, the flat approach to the Castle as well as the Parterre, are retained on the south. The Pavilions are moved, but the character of the garden is proposed to be retained. Changes in addition to changes to the site walls of the Hirshhorn are greatly limited.

And so although Alternative D was the Smithsonian's initial concept, they now believe that Alternative F, which takes into account the feedback they received through the planning process is the best approach.

This provides the basis for the draft Master Plan, which is in front of you. So in this case, the character of the gardens are

maintained. The approach to the Castle is at grade. And excavation below the Castle basement is minimized.

This alternative, which has changed substantially since the original concept in 2014, again, forms the basis for the draft Master Plan.

So with that as a background, I'm going to walk you through several aspects of the draft Master Plan, highlighting how changes in functionality connect to the visitor experience of the different facilities. I'll also describe staff's recommendation as I go, first starting with the Smithsonian Castle.

So I'm sure you're all familiar with the Castle. It is clearly the most recognizable building across the Smithsonian and actually most visitors directly associate it with the Smithsonian due to its iconic nature and location on the National Mall. Because of these important characteristics, the Smithsonian Castle will be enhanced as the main visitor center.

And given this high level of

recognition, the staff recommends the Commission find the Castle is the physical and symbolic center of the Smithsonian Institution as well as the South Mall campus and therefore is the most appropriate location for a centralized visitor center.

Further, the Castle is a hub for a wide range of cultural facilities in and near the National Mall and an important focal point that connects southwest Washington, D.C. with the monumental core.

Improvements to the Castle will have the benefit of both enhancing the visitor experience, but they'll also help return the Castle to its original grandeur.

As such, staff recommends the Commission support the restoration of the Castle to its period of significance, specifically the Great Hall, which you can see here, which is currently broken up by more contemporary alterations, would be restored.

The existing café, book store and

other amenities would be relocated below grade to spaces adjacent to the Castle. And once completed, the Great Hall would be an important first experience for visitors, particularly those who would be entering from the National Mall.

Exhibits found throughout the Great Hall would describe the many roles of the Smithsonian, including those related to research and education as well as the other museums thereby telling the broader story of the institution and at the same time will provide the opportunity for visitor orientation or docents supported by portable tablets and modern technology would be able to provide information to visitors seeking assistance and guidance.

As such, staff does recommend the Commission find the relocation of the number of support facilities for the visitor center to adjacent below grade space will allow for the restoration of the Castle, including the Great Hall, to its period of significance while improving the visitor experience.

Vertical circulation, including elevators and restored stairs would connect the Great Hall to the improved basement level, which would also allow for new interpretive opportunities.

Additional amenities relocated due to the restoration would also be provided here, including café, book store and rest rooms and new and expanded skylights as well as a new ramp entrance from the Haupt Garden would also provide natural light.

From here, the Castle would also provide a direct connection to the Smithsonian Associates facilities, the National African Art Museum and the Sackler Gallery, which are all located in the Quadrangle Building today.

So here you can see how the improved basement would serve for interpretive opportunities and would connect directly to other visitor opportunities located in the Quadrangle.

We've mentioned in the past the Smithsonian is also evaluating opportunities to

protect the Castle from seismic activity. The specific measures and implementation will be developed at the individual project stage, which will require additional studies and engineering. But the outcome of these additional studies will not impact the level of detail identified in the Master Plan.

So as I mentioned, below grade, the Castle and the visitor services are proposed to connect to the Quadrangle Building. This is a three-story facility located underground at the center of the campus with the Haupt Garden as its roof.

Because of its centralized location, it does provide an opportunity to connect the Castle, the Sackler Gallery and the National African Art Museum. And currently, these two museums are accessed through two pavilions which are located above grade.

The Smithsonian seeks to improve and expand the Quadrangle to enhance its functionality and to create a better visitor

experience that connects all of these facilities together.

So you can see here today the building in its existing image. Today the building is challenged by confusing access, disconnected public spaces and a lack of sufficient daylighting. In addition, the roof is leaking and must be removed and replaced. So here, again, is one of the existing spaces.

Changes to the building can address these issues and create a more welcoming environment. The Master Plan proposes to improve the functionality of the Quadrangle through a few ways.

First, the public spaces, including the circulation areas will be consolidated. And this requires moving the existing pavilions to the north so that the public does not have to cut through office space and other back of the house functions.

Secondly, the museums will directly connect to the Castle and visitor services below

grade. And finally, new daylighting and skylights are added to serve exhibit spaces, which are consolidated to the south.

This reconfiguration of public spaces will make the building more user friendly and capable of supporting both visitors as well as the local community that takes advantage of the educational activities and other events, which are currently held on site.

In general, these changes will be beneficial by making the Quadrangle a more functional and modern facility. And as such, staff recommends the Commission support improvements to the Quadrangle, including increased public access, expanded amenities and programming and improved daylighting that will enhance the visitor experience and help the Smithsonian meet its needs.

In addition, new ramps and skylights would be incorporated to add additional daylighting to the Quadrangle. And these new ramps would provide additional entry to the below

grade facilities.

Larger groups and tour buses will be able to disembark along Independence Avenue and then enter the campus. From there, groups will be able to enter the Castle or the Quadrangle and further disperse to the various museums.

Today, the softball campus does not have the potential to support large visitor groups in this fashion. Staff does support improved pedestrian access to help benefit the visitors in balance with the sensitivity to potential impacts to the setting of the Castle.

And, as such, staff recommends that at the time of the individual project design, the Smithsonian evaluate the size and scale of any proposed ramps or stairs to help minimize their impact on the setting of the Castle while balancing the circulation and access needs.

Above ground, the Smithsonian has indicated that allowing visitors to see the presence of the National African Museum and the Sackler Gallery is important as these are some of

the lesser known and least visited museums across the National Mall. At the same time, the existing pavilions are oversized.

The new pavilion locations, in conjunction with the removal of the Ripley pavilion, which is shown here, would allow views into the National Mall -- from the National Mall into the gardens.

So here is an existing view of the Ripley Pavilion. And then here's a proposed view which you can see opens up the view into the garden from the mall. And, again, the actual design of the pavilions is yet to be determined.

The Smithsonian believes that the relocated pavilions could be smaller and also less intrusive and allow for more expansive use of the Castle from the south, including 10th Street and Independence Avenue. Part of the reason for this is to provide a better gateway and a connection to the neighborhoods to the south and southwest.

As a Master Plan is intended to serve

as a guide for the campus for the next 20 to 30 years, it must respond to this changing context, including these neighborhoods which are growing to the south.

So here you can see an existing view from Independence Avenue, again, with the pavilions located along the street frontage. And then a proposed view which shows how a garden that is more inviting could be implemented here.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that the relocation of these pavilions opens up the gardens at the Smithsonian Castle and the National Mall to Independence Avenue and this evolving southwest neighborhood.

And so just looking around to the other direction, this is a view looking to the south from the parterre. And this shows how the garden could connect to the 10th Street promenade which is re-imagined in the SW Ecodistrict as a being a green streetscape. And as such, staff recommends the Commission find the relocation of the pavilions opens up, again, the gardens to

this area.

In response to previous comments as well as those provided through the historic preservation review process, the Smithsonian has provided some additional drawings and analysis regarding the size and location of the proposed pavilions.

These reference drawings have also been included to show the existing pavilions and their relationship to the Freer Gallery, Arts and Industries building as well as the Castle.

So here you can see a view looking at the pavilions with the Arts and Industries Building in the background. This is an existing condition. And then a proposed condition with potential new pavilions. Again, the design hasn't been finalized, but this shows that the pavilions could be smaller in size and scale.

Again, the same view looking towards the Freer Gallery. And then a potential view with an updated pavilion. Again, this is a view looking towards the north with the Castle with

the existing pavilions and then this in the future.

In addition, additional plans have been prepared. These show the proposed and current setbacks with the pavilions. And then here is, again, the proposed condition.

The plans and elevation show that the existing pavilions do have an impact on the current building configuration due to their size and location.

The proposed pavilions would be located further north. However, they will also be reduced in size and height. And the potential exists to design them in a sensitive and compatible way.

The new pavilion locations would allow for more open views as I mentioned before and would also open up the campus from Independence Avenue.

So next moving on I'm going to discuss the Haupt Garden, which again forms the roof of the Quadrangle. As I mentioned, the roof is over

30 years old and nearing the end of its life. The Master Plan does include additional photographs that highlight some of the issues and measures that Smithsonian has taken to address the leaks and the water infiltration.

So here you can see some of the makeshift measures that have been implemented to protect the interior of the Quadrangle and its collections. For example, several pans have been installed that collect the water and then redirect it to drains.

So throughout the engagement process, and as you've heard at the last meeting, many members of the public have expressed their strong support for preserving the garden. In fact, a majority of the comments received through the public comment period advocated retaining the garden in its current form.

Staff does concur that all the gardens within the South Mall campus are exemplary, and they create a beautiful setting for the various buildings and a positive experience for all

visitors.

As such, staff does recommend the Commission find the garden provides a view, too, and setting for the Castle as seen from the south. And further the intimate character and scale of the existing garden is a beloved component of the South Mall and are an important counterpoint to the scale and openness of the National Mall.

The Haupt Garden has a vault over time. Plant materials, art pieces and other elements are continuously changing. And they will continue to change in response to changes in aesthetics, functionality and climate.

As you may know, Smithsonian Gardens is responsible for these seasonal changes replacing specimens and keeping the gardens in a condition that makes them beloved today. And here you can see an image after its completion in the 1980s.

So while replacing the garden in kind could retain the existing configuration, it may

also preclude some of the improvements that the Smithsonian is trying to achieve to benefit the visitor experience, particularly within the Quadrangle Building.

The relocation of the pavilions, as I mentioned, and the addition of new skylights will necessitate some changes to the garden design.

Staff notes that the Smithsonian has committed to retaining the parterre, which is on the south, although the exact design and layout would be determined at the individual project stage.

And further, the Smithsonian has committed to maintaining a high quality landscape along with its intimate character. Most importantly, the Smithsonian is no longer pursuing the large open design that was initially conceived early in the Master Plan process.

The draft Master Plan includes an analysis of the characteristics of the existing gardens and some examples of how they can be sustained in the future. A series of vignettes,

which I'll walk you through, highlights these characteristics as guidance for future design.

And while these additional studies are helpful, the Smithsonian should consider some additional steps to retain the characteristics of the gardens.

Staff suggests that the Commission request that the Smithsonian consider opportunities to reuse existing garden elements where appropriate to provide a link between the history of the garden and its future iterations. The reuse of materials, art and other elements, where feasible, would help tell the story of the gardens through time.

In addition, staff suggests the Commission request the Smithsonian evaluate opportunities to save, store and replant trees and other plantings after construction has been completed. And further requests the gardens continue to accommodate a variety of native plants as well as those that will help support pollinator health.

And, finally, because shade is important to a successful and sustainable setting for visitors, staff suggests the Commission request that at the time the garden is designed, tree replacement should prevent the net loss of tree canopy in accordance with the policies set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.

So in sum, the gardens of the South Mall campus can continue to be cherished by visitors, residents and workers and respond to the changing needs and support of the Smithsonian's mission.

So now, moving on to the Arts and Industries Building, or AIB. At the previous review, the Commission requested additional information about the future use of this building.

It is a National Historic Landmark that is recognized for its architectural style, while initiating one of the greatest museum complexes in the world. The building has a large open space on cross access with an exposed

structure illuminated by natural daylight. And here you can see an image of that building when it was in use in the 1890s.

Like the Castle, the Smithsonian seeks to complete a restoration of this landmark building as funding becomes available. And also like the Castle, the building is challenged by alterations and insertions that have changed the building interior over time.

Staff recommends supporting this restoration, including removing non-historic walls and other contemporary interventions to allow the building to return to its original condition and use as an exhibition hall with large open spaces and a clear expression of structure after a full revitalization is undertaken.

To assist with this effort, in 2016 a director was appointed to plan and manage the programming of the building. And this will help secure funding for the restoration of the building in the future.

Over the last two years, the Smithsonian has held a number of events in the building, including as part of the Folk Life Festival. The campus currently does not have other large scale spaces in the campus that can accommodate such events.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find the Smithsonian Institution has a need for large scale event and exhibition space that does not exist elsewhere in the campus.

And further, the Arts and Industries building can provide that space in a way that's consistent with its original historic use and character. So, for example, the building could be used for temporary exhibits and events related to other museums or other just standalone exhibitions.

And while the building could accommodate other uses, like a visitor center, like we've seen with the Castle, they would likely impact the character and feeling of the dramatic spatial volumes and exposed structure.

We know, with the Commission of Fine Arts, this is one question about whether this building could actually be the visitor's center.

Here you can see some of the diagrams of the building footprint that show how it could accommodate larger events consistent with its original design. However, other types of enclosed spaces, particularly those associated with the visitor's center or other type of use would not work in this manner.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that adding a visitor center and related uses into the building would require adding new walls, rooms and other elements that would not be consistent with the goals of a building restoration.

To accommodate public use, the Master Plan does integrate the Arts and Industries Building into the campus networks by providing upgraded loading and new systems connected to a central plant. These will help support new programming within the building.

In addition, new gardens and improved connectivity through the campus will also enhance the building setting and functionality.

So finally, I'm going to conclude with a discussion of changes proposed to the Hirshhorn site and the sculpture garden. The Master Plan does propose to restore the Hirshhorn Museum building.

In addition, it seeks to improve connectivity between this museum and others on the campus. And we discussed this at the last review. A perimeter wall surrounds the site so there's no direct connection between the Hirshhorn and Arts and Industries building.

The Master Plan does propose to add a small opening on the western side to allow for this connection. As I mention before, previous alternatives had considered much more dramatic changes to the site walls.

The staff recommends the Commission support the restoration of the museum and also just a more limited opening in the perimeter wall

to allow for this direct connection.

Other improvements to the museum include restoration and re-establishment of a below grade tunnel that links the museum building and the sculpture garden. This connection does pass below Jefferson Drive so any future improvements would require coordination with the Park Service.

Staff does recommend the Commission support the re-establishment of this connection as it will help improve access between both the museum building and the sculpture garden.

And then finally, the Master Plan proposes more substantial alterations to the sculpture garden, including a new below grade gallery space.

At concept review the Commission requested the Smithsonian provide some additional details to further explain the proposed changes. The submission does show that the sculpture garden will remain below the level of the National Mall to help preserve that visual

relationship.

The additional submission materials also show that the garden could be modified to accommodate new sculptures and viewing opportunities.

As we know, art continues to evolve as does it relationship with the viewer and participant. And as such, the Smithsonian may seek to alter the sculpture garden in response to contemporary needs related to the function and display of art.

Therefore, staff recommends the Commission request that future project submissions for the sculpture garden should describe the proposed program needs, the existing and proposed functionality of the space and how the project might affect the garden's original design intent.

As with other Master Plans reviewed by the Commission, the Plan will identify projects implemented over time. You had previously requested a phasing plan to understand how these

projects might be implemented.

So you can see here, the Smithsonian has identified restoration of the Castle is the first priority along with the Hirshhorn Museum. Other projects, such as the Quadrangle stair and sculpture garden, would happen further out over time. And in this diagram you can see the design period is shown in white with construction in grey.

To address individual project implementation over time and also potential impacts to historic resources, the Smithsonian stakeholder agencies and the consulting parties will be developing a programmatic agreement, or PA, to comply with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act.

PAs are utilized when the effects of undertakings for the projects are not yet known. And so in this case, with projects over time at the Master Plan level, you may not know what the impacts are.

The PA will set forth the process for

avoiding, minimizing and mitigating effects through the project design and implementation phase. It will also set forth the project process for engagement with consulting parties and other interested members of the public.

So along with the Master Plan, the PA will have an important role in implementing projects over time. We also note that the applicant has prepared some draft design guidelines that would also be used in conjunction with the Commission's review, the PA and other agency reviews.

Staff has reviewed the various alternatives, the public comments and the draft Master Plan. And the draft Master Plan, as I mentioned, includes additional information regarding a number of areas that were identified by the Commission at concept review, including the proposed changes to the Quadrangle, the design of the gardens and the relocated pavilions.

As the Master Plan is intended to

serve as a long-term guide, it must respond to current and anticipated needs while balancing functionality, historic preservation and other goals.

It must also respond to a changing context within a growing city, a changing waterfront, an evolving Independence Avenue while remaining an international destination and a flagship for the Smithsonian Institution.

In general, staff supports the steps that have been taken to achieve Smithsonian's goals while minimizing potential impacts. Since that initial concept was released in 2014, a scheme that staff would not likely have supported, the Master Plan has been changed in significant ways to address concerns about the large open garden or lawn and the dramatic dip in front of the Castle.

The draft Master Plan aims to restore two landmark buildings, improve the functionality of the existing visitor services all the while balancing these various goals. As I mentioned,

specific designs of each project will be further assessed, including their impacts when they return for review.

Staff recommends the Commission support the Smithsonian's preferred alternative as the basis of the campus Master Plan and the preferred alternative to be included in the final EIS.

The Master Plan has also included draft design guidelines, which I have mentioned, that can provide a framework for developing the individual projects. And staff recommends the Commission support the use of guidelines in conjunction with the Section 106 consultation process, further input from the Commission, staff and other agencies.

So in the interest of time, I'm not going to go through all the recommendations, but I will have them here available for you. I'm also available for questions and members of the Smithsonian are here as well. Thank you.

[INSERT - SOUTH MALL CAMPUS MASTER PLAN]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thanks very much.

Mr. Horvath, do you have comments?

MR. HORVATH: Yes. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chairman Bryant, members of the Commission, members of the public. We are pleased to be here this afternoon for this next step in finalizing the Master Plan for the Smithsonian South Mall Campus.

The Master Plan, as mentioned, will guide the design and execution of future projects over the next 20 to 30 years. Thank you, Mr. Flis, for your excellent synopsis.

We trust that you can tell that our team has worked hard to address your comments and advice from our last presentation in January, including connectivity to the south and southwest, sizing and placement of entry pavilions and revision for the Arts and Industries Building.

We are in the final stage of negotiating the programmatic agreement to complete our Section 106 obligations with

signatories including the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the DC State Historic Preservation Officer and, of course, this Commission.

We have also addressed comments and are preparing the final Environmental Impact Statement for circulation later this month.

The Smithsonian cares for more than 12 million square feet of space, much of it iconic and significant. The South Mall is the historic heart of our campus and home to important buildings and beloved gardens.

My colleagues and I take seriously our stewardship responsibilities to cherish and preserve the past. We also work together to maintain our relevance and to engage increasing numbers of people in a rapidly changing world.

The Master Plan, while focused on physical assets, is guided by three overarching principles.

First, transparency. As we contemplate major projects involving some of our

most important facilities, we have endeavored to be as open as possible about our intentions and ambitions. This is a window into a few decades worth of capital renewal.

Second, responsiveness. We have engaged with many constituents over many months, have listened intently and have taken many of your comments and suggestions on board. The Master Plan alternative presented today reflects that.

And third, balance. We strive to walk a delicate line between respecting the past and embracing the future, a tall order indeed. The Master Plan is a concept, a roadmap, if you will. What will follow will be two or three decades worth of specific projects within this plot of land.

While the majority of the work will be restorative, it will also provide us with an opportunity to improve as the Smithsonian benefits from the things that we've learned over many years of use within these buildings and

gardens.

We will bring individual project designs when ready back to your Commission and through the relevant processes such as Section 106.

Matt's presentation did a great job of giving you the details of what the Plan envisions. Let me pull back the lens and provide a brief, strategic level summary.

The Plan will drive the revitalization of important elements of the Smithsonian Institution. Nothing says Smithsonian like the original building, the Castle.

In this case, it is our intention to restore many elements to their historic state and return it to a more public use. We must also ensure that the building can deliver in ways never imagined when it was built in the mid-1800s. Our goal is to both to revitalize the Castle and keep it vital and viable throughout the 21st Century.

We are and have always been committed

to the Enid Haupt Garden. Frankly, we want it to be larger, more welcoming and more active.

Gardens like the Haupt, the Mary Ripley Garden and the Folger Rose Garden are assets that we consider core to our mission. In fact, we sought and received accreditation for Smithsonian Gardens in 2013 from the American Alliance of Museums.

We are establishing an advisory group that will work with us on design thinking for our gardens, including the Haupt Garden. We've already invited the Garden Club of America to identify a member to be part of that group.

Ultimately, relocating the entry pavilions for the two below ground museums, African Art and Sackler, will afford them greater visibility and will allow a more welcoming vista and entrance from the fast-growing southwest section of D.C.

My former colleague, Johnnetta Cole, who is the director of the National Museum of African Art, once told me that she didn't want to

hear anymore that her museum was a hidden jewel. I couldn't agree more.

And we want our growing number of neighbors to the south to feel that we are part of their neighborhood with a more significant connection through L'Enfant Plaza all the way to the waterfront.

As we design the newly placed entrances, we seek to maintain the setting for our historic buildings, the Castle in particular.

We want to be greener and more efficient. The central mechanical plant planned for this site will allow us to reduce energy consumption and utility costs dramatically.

We want to enliven and expand the Ripley Center with natural light and a direct public connection to the Castle. We want to reopen the Arts and Industries Building to the public on a regular basis.

This facility provides something that no other museum building in our complex does, a flexible programming space that would enable

innovative content on a very large scale. Ultimately, a significant additional investment will be necessary to finish the interior of the building.

In the near-term, we are working hard to raise private funds to reopen the building in the short-term in a more rustic state and to enable cutting edge programs different from more traditional offerings.

An example of that took place in December with our long conversation, seven hours of unscripted discussions focused on what makes you optimistic about the future. Not only did we have hundreds of people in attendance in person, but we reached 60,000 others through a webcast of that event.

Our current strategic plan pushes us to reach more people than ever before. The Master Plan will be a key to achieving that goal while ensuring that we respect our past.

Again, I want to express our thanks to the Commission, NCPC staff, consulting parties

and members of the public for their participation during the many months of this process.

I would now like to introduce Richard Kadlubowski, Director of Hoffmann Architects, Washington, D.C. office, a recognized waterproofing and building envelope firm.

A question was raised at the last meeting regarding the approach that would be necessary to replace the Ripley Center roof upon which the Haupt Garden sits. Mr. Kadlubowski will report on his analysis and response to this question. Richard?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Kadlubowski, welcome. We're glad you're here.

MR. KADLUBOWSKI: Thank you very much. Commission, Mr. Horvath, thank you for having me here.

Hoffmann Architects is a specialty design firm that deals strictly in investigation and repair of building envelopes. And waterproofing is a big portion of that project.

Notable projects in the area that we

have worked on is the below grade waterproofing of the rare collections book fault at the Shakespeare Library, Folger Shakespeare Library, waterproofing the below grade addition to the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia, waterproofing the below grade spaces at the Library of Congress, Jefferson Building, the exterior renovation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and then most notably, the restoration of the U.S. Capitol dome. That was our project.

Completed in 1987 by the General Services Administration, Quad Complex is a subgrade building comprising of the Arthur Sackler Gallery, National Museum of African Art and the S. Dillon Ripley Center.

Quad Complex has a footprint of approximately 129,000 square feet of which the roof is a substrate on which the Haupt Garden is built.

The roof assembly is a structural concrete roof slab, a rubberized asphalt

waterproofing membrane adhered to that slab, rigid insulation board, another layer of waterproofing, which is ethylene propylene diene monomer, other people might know it as EPDM, a sheet membrane, rigid insulation, concrete pavers, a gravel drainage layer and then earth overburden of about 4 to 6 feet.

Leaks within the spaces below that were recorded and addressed since as early as 1997. And the leaks have occurred in numerous isolated locations throughout the whole complex that encompass approximately three-quarters of the complex's footprint.

Within the waterproofing industry, the typical and preferred practice of waterproofing is to provide positive side waterproofing. This is the most effective means for preventing water entry.

This is why buildings have broken membranes and foundation walls have waterproofing on the outside. And in this case, with the quad stack, the quad stack is the roof and the

waterproofing membrane is on the outside of that surface.

The exterior waterproofing system on the quad protects the occupants of the building as well as the materials inside, but also the structure on which it's installed.

If a below grade reinforced concrete structure were not waterproofed, moisture would migrate into the concrete, cause the concrete's matrix to break down and deteriorate, expose the steel reinforcing to moisture, which will in turn cause it to rust and deteriorate. And the structure would continue to deteriorate until it is no longer sound.

Currently the 31 year old quad roof has failed and is allowing water to seep into its structure and into the interior spaces. Water intrusion into any interior space is undesirable. The water intrusion into a museum or art gallery is completely unacceptable.

A failed roofing system allows water to seep through the EPDM membrane and saturate

and fill the insulation layer between that and the asphaltic membrane.

The water then travels laterally across the surface of the waterproofing until a breach is located and water then comes into that where -- and then the water again keeps traveling laterally, if possible, to a defect in the concrete, such as a crack or a penetration, and then into the building itself.

If the rubberized asphalt membrane is fully adhered to the concrete as it is intended, the defect through the deck would have to be nearby the location of the defect through the membrane.

If the rubberized asphalt membrane is no longer fully adhered as originally intended, the intruding water, again, will travel laterally to an entry point in the concrete.

Therefore, the entry point at the membrane may not be, and most likely is not, the point of entry into the building itself. Wherever possible, water will flow to any point

where an inlet exists, and typically to the point of least resistance.

In the written testimony of the National Capital Planning Commission meeting for January, a comment was made that the leaking roofs below the quad can be repaired from below. We need to look no further than a remediation of the underground station ceilings now underway in Washington's Metro system.

In my opinion as a waterproofing and building envelope expert with over 31 years of experience, this is an incorrect statement. At the quad, we are referring to a flat expansive roof deck. This below grade building is no way considered a tunnel.

In the tunnel ceilings, the tunnel ceilings are not flared and the injection specifically is performed to plug the holes that are in the concrete structure of that ceiling.

As we also see in the tunnels, that once one leak is plugged, the water travels to another point of infiltration. And then that

leak needs to be plugged and then so on and so on.

These are also considered temporary in stop gap repairs to stop that leak in the tunnel. These are not permanent repairs. Injection repairs are performed with precise placement of injection ports to place the injection grout at the source of the leak.

The sources of the leaks in the quad are unknown. If we apply this injection concept to the quad roof, the injection would have to occur at every weak location.

Knowing that water will continue to flow across the deck to the next entry point, those locations would then also have to be injected. However, the problem here is that the leak would have to occur first to find out where that location is.

This is a reactive response to not a proactive solution to stopping leaks and waterproofing. This is also an admission that the original waterproofing system has failed.

If the intent is to inject enough material to waterproof the entire deck, one must understand that blindside waterproofing cannot cover the entire surface of the quad. Voids will exist.

The injection material cannot travel indefinitely. The sheer weight of the overburden would stop the flow of that material at any appreciable distance. There is currently a water sandwich between the two membranes that will not dry out unless it's removed.

Dressing the roofing from the interior would be considered a form of negative waterproofing, negative side waterproofing. And this is an attempt to prevent intrusion into the interior itself, but it does not address water seeping into the concrete deck.

As discussed previously, water within the reinforced concrete will cause the concrete and the reinforcing to deteriorate. The roof deck is a substrate on which the Haupt Garden is built upon.

It is our opinion that this roofing assembly represents a failed, unconventional approach. And to provide a viable waterproofing envelope for the building below, removals down to the deck are necessary. The existing membrane only protected the quad for 10 years, not the 31 that we're all talking about.

New technologies in waterproofing today, and when this project actually begins, will allow a new waterproofing assembly that can be designed and installed to last for a much longer life span.

Part and possible repairs can address leaks as they occur, however, a new roofing system will resolve the problems that are now causing the leaks.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you very much.

MR. HORVATH: Thank you, Mr. Kadlubowski. I'd now like to introduce a colleague of mine, Marybeth Kelley, Associate Director of Programming from the Smithsonian Associates. The Dillon Ripley Center is home to

the Associates offices and to the majority of its programming. Marybeth?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Welcome, Ms. Kelley.

MS. KELLEY: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Marybeth Kelley, and I'm here on behalf of Smithsonian Associates. We are the Smithsonian Central Education Program representing 800 courses and lecturers, art classes, the exceedingly popular Smithsonian summer camps, conferences and performances each year.

Because our work reflects and augments the research and collections of all Smithsonian Museums, the majority of our programs take place in the underground classrooms and small lecture hall of the centrally located Ripley Center.

We collaborate with colleagues and are sometimes able to secure auditoriums, conference rooms or multipurpose areas in the other museums. But as each museum has expanded their own program offerings, those spaces are less and less available to us.

As a result, we have not only outgrown our own space, but we are obligated to rent non-Smithsonian spaces around the city and surrounding suburbs, thus driving up costs and making access more difficult.

The Smithsonian Associates audience, which includes both the general public and tens of thousands of dedicated local member households, has grown tremendously since we first moved into the space 30 years ago.

We serve preschoolers and young professionals, retirees and teens, people of all ages, passionate about learning and experiencing the Smithsonian in personal and focused ways.

The spaces we welcome them into are no longer adequate. Every summer we turn away scores of disappointed families because we simply do not have the capacity to accommodate them.

Inadequate spaces along with the complicated engineering required to maintain a healthy building more than three stories underground is beginning to show serious signs of

failure.

Incidents of flooding are increasing. There is only one small elevator and staff continue to suffer from a lack of access to natural light.

Evacuating public and staff during a power failure like the one we experienced recently is risky because of inherent design flaws of the building.

I would be happy to elaborate on all of these points, but given the limited amount of time, I would like to affirm Smithsonian Associates strong support of the Smithsonian South Mall Redesign Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Ms. Kelley, very much.

MR. HORVATH: In the interest of time and not wanting to be the irresponsible party for you missing a train, Mr. Chairman, I would just note that we had two other letters of support which were included in our submission, one from

the Smithsonian's Women's Committee and one from Robert Young, an architect. And I would just direct your attention to that.

There is one other individual that I would like to ask to come and give a few remarks. Patrick Revord, on behalf of the Southwest Business Improvement District. Patrick?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you. I guess we have a number of written communications in your packet at your desk, including the CFA letter. So Mr. Revord, welcome.

[INSERT - LIST OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS]

[INSERT - WRITTEN STATEMENTS]

MR. REVORD: Thanks, Chair Bryant, Commissioners. Good afternoon. My name is Patrick Revord. I'm here today on behalf of the Southwest Business Improvement District. And on behalf of the BID, I would like to express our support for the vision set forth by the Smithsonian South Campus Master Plan.

The Southwest BID is a 501(c)(6) organization established and operating in Southwest DC. The BID covers 483 acres of Southwest DC stretching from 15th Street Southwest on the west side over to South Capitol Street on the east side and from Independence Avenue on the north down to Main Street on the south.

Over the past several years, the Southwest BID has developed a strong working relationship with the Smithsonian Museums that line our northern border.

As the museums have increased their local engagement, they have helped to establish both the District of Columbia and the Southwest

neighborhood as thriving arts and cultural destinations while also boosting their own attendance to record levels.

We recently met with Mr. Horvath and the Smithsonian to discuss their preferred Alternative F. And we believe they have made great progress toward embracing the Southwest neighborhood and providing expanded public space for events, dining, classes and exhibitions.

We're excited to see the Smithsonian south campus better connect to the growing Southwest community. And we look forward to the continued integration of the institution's programs and initiatives into the neighborhood. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thanks you very much. Mr. Revord is actually part of the public comment period. And he is the only one that we have signed up.

MR. HORVATH: I just wanted to close by again thanking the Commission, the staff and all of the consulting parties and the public for

their input into this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you very much. We know this is a big and very important project. We bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion. Mr. May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I'll try to keep this short but, I'm often not that short on things -- yes, thank you. So first of all, let me just say I appreciate all the efforts of the Smithsonian.

I do think that Alternative F is much, much better than where this started although the Park Service, I think, would still prefer Alternative B. I think that the was the one that was more minimal. We understand that doesn't necessarily meet all of the objectives.

And as I said I appreciate the efforts that got us to this. I also appreciate the staff's efforts to work with the Smithsonian to address the concerns of the Park Service and many others who have expressed an interest in this.

I also appreciate the high quality

design thought that has gone into what we've seen so far. And I'm impressed that there has been such an investment in design. That's always a good thing.

And finally, I appreciate the letter and testimony we received from Hoffmann Architects. I'm familiar with their work and have great respect for their opinion about the need to replace the roof.

I didn't need to be sold too much on that. I understand that. I've had experience with underground buildings before. And I know that they can have problems, and it's hard to make them completely waterproof.

I do still have some issues with the Plan and a few comments that I want to make.

First of all, I think this whole project got off to a poor start because it started with a design solution. It didn't start with a Master Plan concept.

And however good the work has been since that time, it has been a matter of taking

steps backward in the process. And I really wish that it had started in a different way so that we could have more constructive discussions about design instead of -- or ultimately about planning concepts instead of trying to unwind much of the sophisticated design thinking back to Master Plan level thinking where we were just talking about concepts, about use of space, entry, access, et cetera. It all would have gone much more smoothly if that had happened.

Even today, I would be happier if we were talking about something that was much more generic. I understand and appreciate the fact that people, when they can see an image that shows what some of these concepts might be, it is helpful for them to understand them.

However, some of the most helpful diagrams that we see in this presentation are the very simple ones that show this is where the pavilions might be and this is how big they might be as opposed to the very fancy renderings which show very sophisticated design efforts and very

clear design concepts and are pretty to look at. But they're also quite disturbing from a historic preservation point of view from the National Historic Landmarks in particular.

All that being said, there are a couple things that are still very concerning to me. One is that at our last review in January, I had moved an amendment to the EDR and added a finding. And it was approved by a vote of 7 to 1 and yet it does not seem to be in the Commission's action from January. And I'll repeat it now because I would like to see that it get appropriated again.

Commission finds that the relocated pavilions and addition of large scale ramps to a lower level could alter the setting of the Castle and the Arts and Industries Building and may have undesirable effects on these two National Historic Landmarks.

Again, this was approved. As far as I can tell, it was not addressed in the EDR that we have before us today. And it did not make it

into the action, even though it was supposed to be.

And I just downloaded the action today and scanned it for those words and could not find them anywhere. So putting aside how that can happen, I do believe that that is something that should be incorporated into our report today.

Let's see. The other concern I have is that the plan as it stands right now, what we see in the EDR shows a summary of some of the comments that were in the letter from the Commission of Fine Arts, which we all received today but I had reviewed it earlier.

And I'm just curious about that. I see they did not actually take an action. They reviewed it. And they had comments on it. But they did not approve the concept or anything like that. Maybe they previously approved the concept. I don't recall the whole history of it.

And they had very specific concerns about the use of the Arts and Industries Building and had suggestions for the design of the garden,

suggestions for the location and the design of the museum entrances.

So what I'm curious about at this point is what the Smithsonian's plan is to address those comments because I think they could have a substantive effect on the Master Plan. So perhaps the Smithsonian would like to answer that question.

MR. HORVATH: Following the receipt of the letter from the Commission of Fine Arts after our last meeting with them in January, we met with the Chair and the Secretary of CFA.

We walked through their comments in detail, and we believe that our letter back to them was responsive to the more specific points that were raised in the letter, including the use of Arts and Industries, et cetera.

And it is our anticipation that as we move to the design of the individual project elements that we would engage with them and continue to engage with them on the more specific issues that will come up with each particular

project.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So if I understand you correctly, you do not intend to present the Master Plan to them again?

MR. HORVATH: Not at this point, no.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Not at this point or not ever?

MR. HORVATH: No. We intend to take the individual projects back when they --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I heard you say that, yes. All right.

MR. HORVATH: -- when they are ready to go.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. Thank you. So I find that troubling, too, honestly. To have -- I mean, I've been doing this job for 11, no, sorry, this is my eleventh year.

And I have had many, many projects reviewed. And some of them didn't go so well, honestly. But it never occurred to me to just write a letter back to the CFA and say this is what we intend to do to address it. It just

seems like it's really contrary to the process that all of us are accustomed to.

Now, I mean, granted, I can understand that review of specific projects is ultimately more important or could be more important.

I also recall that early on I had argued that this shouldn't really be a Master Plan anyway. It should be a concept plan for the development and then it should be reviewed on the individual project basis. So, you know, I'm not going to -- I don't want create deliberately inconsistent messages on this.

But what we're hearing now because the Smithsonian and NCPC elected to take what was an EA and make it into an EIS and work it through this process that they're basically not following through with the Commission of Fine Arts.

And granted we are a separate commission. We have separate decision-making authority. However, it all works best when we work hand-in-hand, and we try to get through the entire process in a collegial fashion and in a

productive fashion and work toward a common goal. And I'm not seeing that happen here.

Now I'm not asking you to respond to this. If I have a question for you, I'll ask you.

MR. HORVATH: But could I respond?

COMMISSIONER MAY: That's up to the Chair and not to me. Let me have my piece. If I could finish because I'll be done. I'll be done.

The only thing that I'm asking for at this moment in order to be able to vote in favor of this EDR is that we include the previous finding that was left off last time. And that's what I would insist upon at this stage. But otherwise, I am just expressing my extreme concern about how this process has run.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes. Mr. Horvath, we'll come back. Let's be clear that there is a lot of public hearing and comment to go along the way still, whether it's 106, EIS and then coming back here we still have a final Master Plan to come back here and all of that invites public

comment as well.

MR. HORVATH: I want to reiterate that before we wrote our response formally to the Commission of Fine Arts, we met with the Chair and the Secretary.

We went through in detail their concerns, their issues that they were reflecting on behalf of the Commission. And I believe we were responsive to the feedback that we received.

We are not being disrespectful in any way. And we really appreciated the positive spirit of the back and forth that we had.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you. Ms. Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I would like to associate myself with all of Mr. May's comments and go one step further. At least the federal representatives sitting around this Commission on a regular basis are required to take our projects through the entire process.

And it is painful sometimes and feels burdensome. And there are often times when

certainly in the nine years that I've been doing this job we've been roughed up pretty well by the CFA.

But I don't think it has ever occurred to any of us to respond to comments from the Commission of Fine Arts in a letter or with a meeting and then not present the revisions that are the result of those comments.

And I share Mr. May's concern with setting a precedent for breaking from this process. And I'm wondering if you could explain why the Smithsonian is not subject to the full review process as the rest of the federal agencies are?

MR. HORVATH: We did not say that we would not return to the Commission of Fine Arts. We have not been asked to return at this stage.

We met with their leadership. We sought to understand the specific underlying concerns that were communicated in the letter that we received. And we tried to be responsive to those in our response to that letter so.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I heard that, but the results of their comments and the revisions to the Plan would, in the normal course of events, go back to the Fine Arts Commission as it will come back to us. And I don't understand why that final piece is not going to be implemented in the process.

If we could all say, well, we feel like we've been responsive and we're going to leave it at that, I'm sure there were many times that I would have preferred to do that.

But it didn't -- it's a matter of comity among federal partners that we engage in this process fully. And going back to show our work, like a math problem, is part of that process.

So I just -- there needs to be an explanation why there is an exception in the process for the Smithsonian. Why is that?

MR. HORVATH: We have not been asked to return formally at this point. We have been engaged with the Commission on Fine Arts to

address their concerns. And that's where we are in the process.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. I don't recall being invited back ever.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Ms. White, did you have something to point out?

COMMISSIONER WHITE: And I'm not sure if this is the question, but in the letter we received, the copy of on January 26. It was sent from Fine Arts to Mr. Horvath. It just ends with the Commission on Fine Arts looks forward to the review of a revised Master Plan that responds to its comments. As always, the staff is available to assist.

So you're waiting to be invited to come back essentially is what I thought I heard you answer. Is that correct?

MR. HORVATH: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Dixon.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: So I just want to --

COMMISSIONER WHITE: It seems in their

letter they're pretty clear.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: To be sensitive here, but is this the Fine Arts Commission concern or is this an NCPC concern? I'm sure there's a connection, but I think that that's something that maybe the NCPC maybe can let the Fine Arts work out, and I'm sure they will when they're invited back.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Vice Chair, if I could speak to that, you know, I think that may be a process question in terms of how all federal agencies have their projects reviewed and approved by this Commission.

And it's always been, you know, Commission of Fine Arts on the more aesthetic side of the issues and NCPC more on the planning side of these. But they go hand-in-hand and we always have to satisfy both.

And to see that some of that is going to be left off in this particular case, I think, is concerning to those of us who have to go through this process.

And, frankly, you know, it could be setting a bad precedent for some who also think that maybe they're no quite fully required to go through this painful, but as Ms. Wright said, generally beneficial process.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, all. I think Mr. Dixon makes a pretty relevant point. The matter before us is NCPC's jurisdiction.

While it has been pointed out that in the letter, in CFA's January 26 letter, that they certainly anticipate your bringing your revised Master Plan back to them. You, upon invitation, and that may be pretty close to an invitation, you'll do that.

So if we could, perhaps, return our focus on the matter before us and let our votes rise or fall on the matters before us as pertaining to this Commission and our process would be my suggestion. Ms. White?

COMMISSIONER WHITE: So I have a couple of comments on the matter before us. And first, I just want to thank the Smithsonian and

Mr. Horvath in particular for listening closely to what our concerns were.

And I think that there have been some good changes here in working through those considerations. One with the Haupt Gardens preserving the spirit of the garden and showing movement from what the original concept was to present, I'm very appreciative of.

I also was really glad to see the minimal impact on the Hirshhorn because I think that's such a significant space and architecturally to have that integrity maintained as much as possible was a really good move.

And I personally am really happy to see those pavilions go. I just don't like them. They're big and too much. But opening up that viewshed, and we got this wonderful presentation last meeting on what's happening to the south and that welcoming corridor to the Castle, I think, is really significant and important.

So, again, I just want to reiterate what's been said that Smithsonian is an

extraordinary institution, a very beloved space. So thank you for listening in to have senior leadership here to walk us through this and share the strategic thinking. So I hope you work it all out with the Commission of Fine Arts.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: I just want to thank the Smithsonian also for being very responsive to the thought that we had about adapting to the evolving urban context of the south.

I mean, I had a meeting with the DS as well and talked about that. I mean, I would say just tell a better story, but I actually see a lot of the narrative in the materials that build that out. So I really appreciate that. The only hope for me would be is that as our District remains dynamic and that this plan can also remain dynamic as well.

So I haven't heard a lot about the introduction of technology or those other things as well. And so I hope that we don't get a

building 30 years from now that's dated already.

So I really hope that as you guys think about the projects or finalize these strategies that you really are thinking about the ability to incorporate new technology, new means, you know, expansive growth and those other things as well.

So I don't want to lock you in amber. I want to make sure you have some positive trajectory in here as well.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to commend the Smithsonian Institution for responding to many of our comments and concerns.

I have a couple of kind of planning concerns that have to do with sort of the perimeter and how we're welcoming visitors into the space. So I don't know if we could turn to Slide 33 and 34.

The first one has to do with the no entrances off of Independence Avenue. And I'm

trying to understand if there were the entrances closer to the Freer and the Arts and Industries Building. And I don't know if those exist today. I think that the pavilions sit there today.

And I'm excited, if that is the case, that we are going to be inviting people into the space, not only in the center, right along 10th, which was the focus of your primary presentation, but also at those edges. Is that the case?

MR. FLIS: That is the intention. I can let the landscape architect speak to the design details, which would be developed. But the idea is to have more openings on this frontage, with the 10th Street alignment still being the primary access because it is along that alignment with the parterre and the Castle.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Okay.

MR. FLIS: And the Ripley gate will remain there too as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: You know, we seem to be very, very proud of that fence at 10th. You know, we spent a lot of time talking

about the White House fence and how tall and all this stuff. And that seems pretty tall.

And I know this is a detail, but, you know, it's a foreboding kind of thing to me. And I would recommend that the Smithsonian Institution look at that.

I mean, we're spending a lot of time talking about this space and how it will be used and how people will be welcomed into it. And it's not very welcoming when you're confronted with a, I don't know, 12 foot high kind of iron fence. It feels a little bit more like jail than welcome to my garden.

So, you know, I don't think that has any impact on the EDR, but I would recommend that we look at that going forward.

And then maybe if, I don't know. I think it's around 50 there is -- I'm also focused on the garden walls along Independence Avenue. So, yes, maybe this would be a good place to start.

So here we're seeing those -- well,

no, I want to see the new scheme. Sorry. I couldn't tell where it was. This is it. Yes.

So I'm trying to understand what those big white things are at the bottom along Independence Avenue that kind of line the bottom and then go up into the garden. So what is that?

MR. FLIS: So that's showing the idea that there might be more skylights. And so if you look at the floor plan, the idea was to kind of define the perimeter over low grade spaces with skylights.

Again, they could be wider, narrower, but that's the intention is that you would need some skylights. There are some light monitors and other elements in those locations today as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Mm-hmm. And so will there be this knee wall concept that's on my Page 106? I don't know what page you have. I didn't see it in your presentation today. Okay.

MR. FLIS: That might be.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Is that where it

is? Okay. But I'm trying to understand the concept of how we're envisioning to secure the space.

I know at the last presentation I asked Ms. Trowbridge about, you know, what are the security concerns because I think of a garden as an open and public space that we want to invite people into. And we've got big fences and walls and how tall and all those things.

I don't know that today, again, is the right time to ask these questions, but I can certainly tell you I am very, very interested in sort of understanding what the needs are of the Smithsonian Institution to secure the space.

Because, you know, to the extent it can be America's garden, which I know, no disrespect to Ms. Haupt, but we all own it now. We all want to claim it as ours as well. And we want to have access to it in a way that I think is going to be important.

And then on my last one, and again I didn't see it, Matt, in your presentation, but it

was on Page 111 in the book. This is the perimeter security diagram --

MR. FLIS: Mm-hmm.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: -- where we like our knee walls apparently. And I'm trying to understand why we need knee walls in the middle of the entrance coming out of the mall into the Haupt Garden and Quadrangle area.

We are spending a lot of time and attention talking about how to create access and visibility from the mall into this space to invite visitors into these two wonderful museums and also the garden.

And in the middle of what could be a really welcoming opening walkway into the space, we put a knee wall. And it's because we need places for people to sit. I say, let them find somewhere else to sit.

If it's because of some security concern that I haven't heard of, I'd like to learn more about that.

MR. FLIS: Sure. Well, there is a

comprehensive security need, which would be a project to be addressed with the campus, which is what the intention of that diagram is showing, which would be further developed.

The Master Plan includes a couple of different strategies to address perimeter security so it may or may not be more appropriate in certain locations. But I think that's an important comment for the Smithsonian and for staff to consider when they start to detail out some of those drawings.

You want the vision of the open space to be compatible with the perimeter security. And we always try to address that in all these projects so I think that's a good comment.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I don't think there's any kind of, I mean, the pavilions are there now, but, you know, people just walk in there, right, whenever they want? I mean, is that right?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Could you stand up to the --

MR. HORVATH: Sorry. Currently, there are gates at both entrances off the mall and then the gate, the grand gate, that sits on Independence, so it effectively creates a barrier.

And to Matt's point, we've been looking at a couple of different ideas. One would be an iron sort of gate with trees around it to form a perimeter on Independence.

We could look at other ideas. But we're still testing ideas with the concerns of making sure that we have adequate security.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Yes. And I really appreciate that. I just hope that my comments are heeded as you think forward about the sort of open and connected and welcoming space that we're trying to create here. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Ms. Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: My concerns with the process notwithstanding, there is a lot of movement that in the substance of the plan that

shows a great deal of improvement.

I've had three issues which I've hammered on and they're all -- you know, I was very glad to see more specificity about the programming for AIB, that the base isolation question will be addressed appropriately during design and development and is not sort of pre-decisional.

And the last one was the garden, which was ironically, I have to also say I don't agree with everything that CFA had to say about the plan. My one hope is that you'll continue to look at -- can we go to 109, which shows the big rendering of the --

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Pavilion.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: -- the swoop.

MR. FLIS: I may not have that one in this program.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. FLIS: I had to cut it out.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: It's a rendering that shows the angle still of letting the light

in by what would be the northeast corner of the site there where the little top hat pavilion is now.

MR. FLIS: Here's another view.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I understand that the last thing that you want to do is create underground space that makes you want to be anywhere but there because it's dark and artificially lit and all that stuff.

I hope that you can continue to look at different ways to let the light in. It's not just for aesthetic reasons. One of the things -- this is a perfect shot to illustrate it.

If you're trying to create, you know, a through-put, one of the things that I love about this plan is the removal of the pavilions because they are just not -- they do a lot to make you feel like you're not welcome here.

Owning the Forrestal Building, I mean, we couldn't really do more to make people feel unwelcome with that building. We all hope that one day we'll meet a different fate.

It seems to me while it lets the light in, it also blocks the view and there's a little bit more eloquently what the pavilions do now which is to block your view and make you -- if you're a tourist and you don't know, it doesn't do anything to invite you into the site so if it could be lowered. I understand the function but I hope that can get some more attention for the whole composition and also for viewshed purposes.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Can I connect that to that just for a second? My perception -- I would love comment from the institution. My perception is that I agree -- by the way, that the current pavilions are not very inviting or attractive.

My perception is that what makes this an improvement, okay, I hear your point and I agree with your point, but these pavilions are pulled back deeper into the space than the current pavilions are which sit more proud to the Mall.

I think that allows for, and we're

seeing it here, that kind of bigger perspective into something is happening -- something more is happening beyond -- besides just the pavilion blocker, if you will.

I think the placement has something to do in my mind with how it's improved, even though I agree that it is still somewhat of a blocker. It will hopefully be more transparent with the glass which also should help that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll just say that I agree with Commissioner Gallas and the issues regarding perimeter security. That was one of our concerns as well.

I trust that we will work through that as the design process continues.

I would agree with Ms. Wright on the aspirations for how these entries can be made. We have concerns about the stairway and ramp that goes down as well.

What we see in this image is a stairway that goes down and makes for these very large glass walls that are 100 feet away from the

castle which seems really far numerically but, in terms of how we perceive it, it's actually very close and I think that shows up in some of the renderings. We are very concerned about that.

Which brings me back to my original point which is that I would like to move an amendment to the EDR and I will do that whenever you are prepared to accept it.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I think now is the proper time.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So I move that we amend the EDR to add a finding. I'm not sure what section it goes into.

MR. FLIS: I just want to say for clarification we did pull the original motion. It was captured in there in the signed version. I think something just happened when it got transferred electronically.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

MR. FLIS: Staff did not omit it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sure you did not.

MR. FLIS: I just wanted to clarify that but we also would support the amendment.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, it shows up online as a PDF that just says "signed." It doesn't actually show a signature.

MR. FLIS: Anyway, where that is, wherever it should go into this. I don't care exactly where it goes into the action but the wording is, "The Commission finds that the relocated pavilions and the addition of large-scale ramps to a lower level could alter the setting of the castle and the Arts and Industries Building and may have undesirable effects on these two national historic landmarks.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: And to be clear, that was existing language that accidentally was omitted.

MR. FLIS: It was in the previous motion.

COMMISSIONER MAY: In the concept it was an action.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes. This is a

correction. This is not making up something,

It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on that proposed technical amendment? Hearing none, all in favor of that amendment say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed no.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: (Moves the EDR)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The EDR has been moved. Is there a second to the EDR?

COMMISSIONER WHITE: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. Just to be clear, the question before us is to approve the comments. We still have miles to go and comments to give further direction to the Smithsonian as they continue to work on the master plan and bring back to us a revised version or another version of the master plan in due course and lots of public comments.

It's been moved and seconded. Sensing no further discussion, all in favor of the EDR as amended say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed no. Thank you. It's unanimous.

Ms. Trowbridge, thank you for your continued collaboration and we looked forward to more of it. Thank you so much. That was a good discussion.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 5B is the preliminary and final site and building plan for the building exterior, the vestibules, and the site improvements at the National Air and Space Museum. And we have Ms. Lee.

[INSERT - NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM]

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, considering how much time we spent on the first one and the relative what I anticipate -- I may be wrong but what I would anticipate would be less controversy about this particular presentation, I was wondering if the chair and the commission would consider that we bypass the presentation and go straight to discussion on this. I don't need a presentation on this particular issue.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Did anyone come prepared with a boat load of questions or concerns on this?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I have a few comments but we don't need a presentation.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Okay.

(Laughter)

Ms. Lee, for the many hours you spent, you are dismissed. Let's keep the presentation up and remain there in case we need to flip to a slide in response or to highlight Mr. Gallas' or other's questions or comments.

Mr. Gallas.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Thank you very much for making such a great package which allowed us -- all the preparation that has gone into this and the site visits and all of that that has gotten us to this point. That is evidence of a great job so thank you.

My comment really was to thank the Smithsonian Institution for accepting the recommendation of the Commission. I think it was to just sort of keep a contingent -- seek contingent approval for a new entrance, gateway on the Independence Avenue side of the building which we were sad to see would have been removed in the original presentation because of budgetary constraints. We certainly understand and respect that reality. At the same time it was such a beautiful design and made us fall in love and you took it away.

(Laughter)

We are happy to see it back. We do appreciate that. The sentiment, I think, is

important. That is my only comment.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you.

Other comments? Ms. White.

COMMISSIONER WHITE: I had the exact same feeling. I think it's really smart the way it's worded so that if you have a future funder who would see that as a wonderful donor recognition opportunity. It really made such a different on that facade in welcoming people and weather-related issues so thank you. That was a very smart way to address it.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Other questions or comments? Hearing none, is there a motion on the EDR?

COMMISSIONER RHODES: Moved.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. The question before us is the approval of the preliminary and final site and building plans for the exterior vestibules. All in favor of the EDR as presented say aye.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed no. Thank you.

Ms. Lee, you can take the rest of the day off.

(Laughter)

MS. LEE: Thank you.

NATIONAL DESERT SHIELD AND DESERT STORM MEMORIAL

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 5C is approval of comments on site selection for the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial. We have Mr. Flis. I declare today Matt Flis day.

MR. FLIS: I thought I was going to get a break.

(Laughter)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This project was submitted by the National Park Service in collaboration with the National Desert Storm Memorial Association. There are potential sites for the Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial for your review and comment.

The applicant brought these three sites before you back in December at which time

you requested the development of initial design concepts for each site to further evaluate their suitability. The applicant has done so and returned for your review today.

Just as a reminder, Congress did authorize a memorial in Public Law 113-291 which states that the National Desert Storm War Memorial Association may create the memorial as a commemorative work on federal land in the District of Columbia.

The memorial will be located in Area 1 but not within the reserve of the National Mall. The allowances in the Commemorative Works Act, or CWA, applies to the site selection and design of the memorial. The CWA is a federal law, as you know, that guides the memorials process in Washington, D.C.

The act also provides some guiding criteria, which are here on the screen, related to the design and site selection including situating the working surroundings that are relevant to the memorial, locating the work so it

doesn't interfere with other memorials, and locating the work to protect open space, public use, and cultural and national resources.

So in terms of process we thought this would be a good opportunity to provide you an update and overview of the site selection and design review. In the past the site and design approvals have occurred independently so site selection occurred first with an approval and then the memorial design commenced and was approved as well so they are somewhat distinct.

However, because the site selection decision is hand and foot with the memorial design, the process has been updated to allow the commission to evaluate potential memorial sites with similar information about the potential designs, as well as the memorial program.

At this stage the applicant has provided those early designs as a way to evaluate the capacity of each site and how it would accommodate the memorial program. For example, in this case, staff was looking at how the sites

could accommodate a sacred or contemplative space.

With the comments today, and also the comments that they received from the Commission of Fine Arts, the sponsor and Park Service will determine the preferred site and return with the memorial design for a preliminary and final approval.

A little background. Operation Desert Storm and Desert Shield represented a coalition of 34 countries in an international effort led by the American Armed Forces to deliberate Kuwait. Almost 700,000 American service members participated and several hundred gave their lives in service.

The operations were seen as a success. They restored the faith and prowess of the U.S. military and, as such, the events hold a unique place in history by helping close the wounds of the Vietnam War.

So the memorial focuses on three broad areas. First, the pivot, which I just mentioned,

whereby Desert Storm and Desert Shield were seen as restoring the bond between American people and the military. Secondly, the coalition of international diplomacy that was integral to the success. Then, of course, the commemoration of those who served.

The Park Service and association have continued to revise their criteria to guide the evaluation and selection of the site for the memorial. These do parallel with the CWA guidance and will provide some additional detail. Particularly important are the criteria for an intimate visitor experience as well as a sacred space for reflection.

The association had previously indicated their preference for a site of at least 1.5 acres, but I'll note that the proposed design would occupy generally less than half an acre, although that size varies somewhat between the sites.

I'm going to walk you through the three sites which are shown here, as well as the

design studies that were developed for each. In the case of Constitution Avenue and Walt Whitman Park, the applicant has actually developed multiple schemes which I'll also show.

First is the Constitution Avenue site. This is located southwest in the corner of 23rd and Constitution just north of Lincoln Memorial. The Institute of Peace is located to the north. The future Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center is located to the east with the Lincoln Memorial to the south.

Today the site is mostly long with some recreational fields. Here are some images with the park-like setting today including views of the Lincoln Memorial which you can see in the background. While Constitution Avenue terminates at this location, historically it actually extended all the way to the river which would be a beneficial longer-term project.

So of the sites under consideration staff feels that this location provides the strongest connection to the proposed memorial.

The welcoming response to returning service members following Desert Storm is seen as an important closure to the Vietnam War era.

The location near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, as well as the visitors center, would help reinforce this connection. In addition, the site is near other 20th century war memorials, as well as diplomatic agencies which I mentioned, including the U.S. Institute of Peace and Department of State.

In terms of the connectivity, here you can see pedestrian access to the site from the National Mall and other nearby memorials. It can be readily accommodated through the existing sidewalk network as well as signalized street crossings.

The site's location is a gateway to the Monumental Corridor and near the Lincoln Memorial and does offer some opportunities and challenges. The memorial could help establish the first links in this area for an improved trail and sidewalk network to future memorials

that could extend further to the west. Connections to the waterfront could also be improved as we'll discuss later when we discuss the Belvedere site.

In addition, DC Water Tunnel Project, which I mentioned previously, as well as the future levee may impact the site. Based upon the current discussions regarding those projects, the impact should be relatively minor and can be addressed through continued coordination.

In addition, because the site is an open landscape and a siting for the Lincoln Memorial, the design strategy should consider views to and from this site, as well as how to minimize any impacts.

I will note that in the future four rows of concentric trees are proposed to be installed south of the site. These are consistent with the original historic planting plan for the Lincoln Memorial. Here you can see a plan of that area with the Lincoln Memorial in the center of the site located to the north or to

the right on the screen.

So the applicant has developed three schemes for the site. Scheme 1 and 2 located the memorial in the northeast corner of the site. Both include a centralized scared space and a sculptural element generally defined by memorial walls.

In Scheme 1 this uses a circular plan to arrange the elements, while the axial relationship is to the Lincoln Memorial, as well as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and, by extension, the Washington Monument are implied through the arrangement of the different elements.

This is a birds-eye view of the same scheme looking towards the south. Again, you can see a series of walls are used to enclose a specific memorial area.

Scheme 2, again in the same general location, uses a left hook in the plan. It incorporates a series of tablets to recognize the coalition nations. Here again is a perspective of

that scheme showing again a commemorative wall, sculptural elements, as well as tablets.

Finally, for this site Scheme 3 is oriented east to west along Constitution Avenue. This scheme also occupies the largest area. The design incorporates a series of rooms with different components of the memorial and these are all tied together by a large commemorative wall, which forms the northern portion of the memorial.

Overall looking at all three schemes these design studies show that the site could accommodate the memorial program in several different ways. A sacred or contemplative space as identified in sponsor's program needs could be placed on the site with appropriate setbacks and buffering.

As such, staff recommends the Commission support the site as the preferred location of the proposed memorial given its strong thematic connections to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, proximity to other 20th

century memorials, as well as nearby diplomatic agencies.

Staff also recommends the Commission request the applicant continue to develop the three schemes for the site and to address a number of other considerations.

For example, given the cultural and historic landscape of the Lincoln Memorial, as well as the site setting, develop alternative commemoration strategies. The applicant should consider a landscape=oriented approach that minimizes vertical elements.

And not referred if walls are used, they should be detailed in terms of their use and evaluate their height and length to avoid monolithic elements that could block these.

Moving on to the second site, this is Walt Whitman Park, which is located along the E Street corridor near the intersection of 19th Street N.W. The site is primarily grass with large shade trees around the perimeter.

A gathering area and former playground

occupies the east end of the block. The White House is about three blocks to the east and the Department of State is two blocks to the west.

The park is located in an urban setting. It is surrounded by a variety of office and commercial uses including some federal facilities, as shown here on the screen. The site is easily accessible by a variety of modes of transportation.

The site was also identified in the Monumental Core Framework Plan. An excerpt to that is shown here on the screen as part of a linear commemorative park that would link the White House with the Kennedy Center. This corridor has also been suggested for future presidential memorials but this is not a concept that has yet been implemented.

Thematically from the staff's perspective Walt Whitman Park is more removed from the other 20th century war memorials which are obviously located further to the south. The park is located near other sites that might have

some relationship like the Department of State, the U.S. Diplomacy Center. Although these might be relevant, staff feels that these connections might not be really evident to potential memorial visitors.

Also, given the urban setting the site does have the opportunity to accommodate a variety of park uses that could benefit the surrounding area including office workers and students. These uses could be both passive as well as active. The introduction of a contemplative sacred space could create challenges.

Therefore, staff recommends the Commission find that a memorial that does not require a contemplative gathering space may better accommodate active recreational and park uses and this would be appropriate and desirable in this urban setting.

Finally, I'll note that the memorials in the museum's master plan also recommends this site include elements related to the life of Walt

Whitman for whom the park is currently named.

For this site the applicant has developed two schemes. Both designs use the eastern portion of the block while leaving a lesser portion open for other uses.

The first scheme creates a series of small rooms that tell the story of the memorial through a processional experience. Here you can see an axonometric view looking towards the northwest. The series of small rooms are defined again by walls of varying heights and sculptural elements are proposed, as well as trees to align with Rawlins Park which is further to the east.

The second scheme for the same site utilizes a larger central gathering space surrounded by walls and other commemorative features. This is the same scheme again with another view. Again, you can see walls are used to define the spaces and provide a distinction between sacred space, gathering areas, and the surrounding context.

From staff's perspective this site

does have the opportunity to accommodate vertical elements because it's relatively open and unencumbered. However, long and tall walls can blocks views of the memorial limiting the visibility and awareness by the public and the surrounding context.

Over all these concepts do show that the memorial program could be accommodated in several ways. However, as I've described previously, the thematic connections may not be that readily evident. Also the potential for recreational uses may not be complementary to the memorial program.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that while the site is flexible in terms of design and could accommodate a contemplative gathering space, the location of the site may be better suited for another memorial.

Finally, the last site is the Belvedere which is located along the Potomac River adjacent to Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway.

It is immediately across from several busy streets as well as some active recreational uses. The Kennedy Center, as you know, is to the north along with the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge.

The site is a circular landscape island you can see around the screen adjacent to the Rock Creek Park Trail, which is a popular and active recreational trail. Again, there is a network of streets and ramps connecting to I-66 as well as Rock Creek which generally isolate this site from the rest of the National Mall.

Staff believes that this site holds limited opportunity for an intimate visitor experience due to the adjacent roadway traffic and other active recreational uses. In addition, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway is heavily used by over 30,000 vehicles a day.

Thematically the site does provide views of Arlington National Cemetery, which is across the river. Therefore, the memorial could have some relationship to this backdrop.

In addition, while the site is located west of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and other 20th century memorials, the pedestrian access, as it shows here on the screen, is not easy or intuitive. Getting to the site actually requires crossing a number of uncontrolled intersections and making it a challenge even for somebody who knows where they're going.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that access to the site is particularly difficult from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, as well as the west side of the National Mall due to the existing street network and limited pedestrian infrastructure.

That said, the Park Service has been looking at the challenges associated with this site in this area. They are currently evaluating proposed reconfiguration of the intersection adjacent to the Belvedere.

This would improve accessibility for pedestrians by providing a clear crosswalk immediately adjacent to the site. Again, other

improvements would be necessary across the broader area.

In terms of the memorial design, the applicant prepared one design study for this site. This concept utilizes a series of walls to buffer the adjacent road and rail to create a sacred contemplative space.

In addition, a tall vertical element is proposed to help terminate the Constitution Avenue viewshed, which is symbolized by that red dash line which would be the extension of Constitution.

Here you can see that same scheme showing the perspective. Again, the walls and vertical elements are shown here as well. Again, due to the challenges of adjacent traffic, noise, and recreational trail, these walls are used to create a distinct memorial space.

However, they also cut off the memorial from the extension of Constitution Avenue. You may recall the Belvedere was intended to be that terminus for the corridor and

allow for sweeping views of the river. Here you can see an historic image of the Belvedere.

Staff believes that the use of walls to establish a sacred space will block views along the historic Constitution Avenue corridor. This is contradictory to the historic purpose of the Belvedere.

A memorial program that does not require a sacred or contemplative space could remain more open and also connected to the surrounding context, and also integrate better with the recreational trail.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that the site could be a successful location for memorials but would not require a contemplative gathering space and, therefore, could preserve this visual connection.

Also, overall the proposed design shows that the challenges associated with creating a contemplative space here are difficult to overcome.

I will note that the Commission of

Fine Arts did express support for the site noting that it could accommodate vertical elements and would be highly visible from the river and nearby bridges. The applicant will have to take these comments, as well as the Commission's comments today, in determining their preferred site.

Finally, I just want to conclude by talking a little bit about the memorial elements generally. The design studies have been really hopeful in analyzing the capacity of each site to accommodate the memorial program. They've also helped identify some issues to be considered as the design advances.

For example, as I mentioned, all the concepts use walls as a major memorial element. While these can be integrated in the right context, they can also be monolithic, block views, and be reminiscent of other memorials.

As such, staff recommends the Commission find that a predominate feature of the concept designs at each location are commemorative walls which help to create

intimacy, but also pose challenges to these issues which I've mentioned.

Further, staff does suggest the Commission recommend the applicant consider alternative commemorative elements that achieve the same purpose while distinguishing the memorial from others with similar wall features. Further, the Commission should recommend that if walls are used, the applicant reconsider their height and scale to avoid these challenges.

So, therefore, it is the Executive Director's recommendation that the Commission support the Constitution Avenue site as the preferred location for the memorial due to its strong thematic connection and proximity to other related memorials and also note the site would allow for a contemplative gathering space.

The Commission further requests that the applicant continue to develop the designs to address the additional comments, which I've outlined, including considering the landscape oriented approach.

Regarding the Walt Whitman Park site, the Commission finds that the site is flexible in terms of design and could accommodate a contemplative space, but a memorial that does not require a scared space would be more compatible with active recreational and park uses. Further, the site may be more appropriate for another memorial theme.

Then regarding the Belvedere, we note the site is close to an active road with significant traffic and finds the site is difficult to access from the National Mall. And also find the proposed design is challenging in terms of accommodating the scared space.

Finally, regarding the memorial and site design, we note that the site of the memorial area has been reduced and that a sacred space is critical to the memorial. Further, loss of a consistent element of designs and they should be re-evaluated and other elements reconsidered.

That concludes my presentation. I'm

available for any questions. The association is also here to provide some brief comments. Thank you.

[INSERT - NATIONAL DESERT STORM AND DESERT SHIELD MEMORIAL]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Shaw.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: Thank you. I want to mention --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Can I hold you? We have a couple speakers. That's my fault.

Go ahead, Mr. Stump. Welcome. He is part of the CEO of the National Desert Storm War Memorial Association. He is here to show us a video that we are looking forward to seeing.

MR. STUMP: If you remember the last time we met on December 7th Congressman Roe alluded to his background as being a planner. I promise Secretary Baker will not make those same remarks.

SECRETARY BAKER: Let me begin by thanking you for your dedication to the history and beauty of our nation's capital. The National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial project is very close to my heart because liberating Kuwait was the right thing to do.

We stood by our time-honored principles of helping those in need while

expecting nothing in return. Operation Desert Storm was much more than just the 100-hour war as the media likes to portray it. It was a major event which should never be forgotten.

More than 600,000 answered the call and nearly 400 made the ultimate sacrifice. The events of 27 years ago also remain an enduring example of our nation and the world at its best. It provided a foreign policy, diplomatic, and military blueprint that can guide future generations of American leaders.

Assembling the 34 nation coalition that worked together to free the people of Kuwait is a striking example of what is possible when countries work together to solve a common problem. In doing so, we obtained international and domestic support and we followed the United Nations resolutions to the letter of the law.

We established a crystal clear military objective on how to liberate Kuwait. Once that objective was accomplished, we went home. As President George Bush mentioned before

a joint session of Congress in March of 1991, "We confront an enemy abroad and in the process we transformed a nation at home."

Of course, President Bush was referring to the elimination of the Vietnam syndrome that haunted our national society for more than two decades. Due to the rapid and resounding success of Operation Desert Storm, Americans' perception and treatment of their military and its veterans forever changed and changed for the better. What an enduring legacy.

The world should not forget what we accomplished in 1991 and future generations should remember the hope, the courage, and the leadership inspired by this great victory.

I hope the Commission will vote today to allow this memorial to be located at 23rd and Constitution, the most fitting place of honor, prominence, and prestige that it so rightfully deserves. Thank you all very much.

MR. STUMP: That's a hard act to follow. I'm just going to sit down.

Chairman Bryant, Commissioners, NCPC staff, it is wonderful to be back with you again as we meet to push ahead and move ahead with this National Desert Storm and Desert Shield memorial site selection process.

I want to just briefly say that our organization totally agrees with the very fine points made in the staff report regarding the 23rd and Constitution site. We definitely appreciate the rationale and the basis for arriving at those decisions. They are very factually based and factually rooted. Thank you very much for that.

I just want to point out that from the beginning our team has followed this site selection process, as Secretary Baker said, down to the letter of the law. We've respected the process and those involved in implementing it.

We understood site selection with the sincerely and sober focus on determining the most appropriate location for this memorial. We based that on the available sites listed on the 2M

plan. Following a thorough and exhaustive study of potential site visits, we happened upon this location at 23rd and Constitution.

I've got to say that our team kind of had the same initial reaction. Kind of like when you're going on your first date, "Wow, this might be the site." Might be. And it wasn't until after the further study we realized all of the strong and compelling geographic and thematic connections that Matt had referenced in his presentation.

Our initial gut reaction was solely based upon the layout and the esthetics of this site and nothing more. It wasn't until we did that further study and realized what was close by. We really didn't know.

Our team is completely 100 percent not from the District so this is all new to us and we kind of stumbled through this process. Following hundreds of hours of intense study and design work the Commission of Fine Arts voted on March 15th to award us the Belvedere site.

Commissioners, I have to tell you this Belvedere site is a phenomenal site when it comes to visibility. I mean, it could arguably be one of the most visible in the District. However, based on our criteria, our team was seeking really a site that had a combination of visibility with visitability.

What I mean by visitability, as Matt had mentioned, the opportunity for pedestrians to easily access and visit this memorial, as well as have a place of relative quiet. I've learned that there really isn't any quiet place in Washington so a relative quiet for reflection and contemplation. We feel strongly that this site at 23rd and Constitution allows us to do that.

Commissioners, we have truly conducted a comprehensive and thorough due diligence throughout this entire process. There have been several potential obstacles that have been mentioned regarding this 23rd and Constitution site over the past two years. We believe they have all been addressed.

Some have even mentioned the proximity to the reserve as a cause of concern, but if the intent was to have no future commemorative work on this location, on this parcel, why didn't Congress designate the entire area as part of the Reserve Act in 2003 rather than the southern tip of it?

This leaves one to easily surmise that it was anticipated that a future commemorative work would one day occupy this site. My question for all of you is why shouldn't it be the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial?

We believe that this location not only serves the best interest for our organization and for our mission, but also for the goals of the District and its over 20 billion visitors annually. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Stump.

We also have a public comment period and one person has signed up. Ms. Darwina Neal.

It's nice to have you back.

[INSERT - LIST OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS]

MS. NEAL: Thank you, Chairman Bryant. I'm glad to be back but, as Mr. Stump said, there have been many hard acts to follow so I almost don't feel I need to comment.

Anyway, I'm an architect retired from the National Park Service as Chief of Culture Resources for the National Capital Region. I already submitted comments. Actually, I also support the Commission's staff report which I think is very good.

In the interest of keeping the time short, I will keep my comments short and add a couple that I think might be appropriate that haven't been mentioned.

The Belvedere's historic structure and setting were designed as the axil terminus of the Constitution Avenue corridor so it's important to preserve its historic balustrade walls, walk, and foreground circle in the historic context and keep axial views along that walk and foreground circle in their historic context -- and keep axial views along that corridor to the river

open.

This site has no visual function or circulation relationship to Vietnam Veterans or other 20th century war memorials or the Mall. Also, because of the noisy intensity of passing traffic and the difficulty of pedestrian access to it, this site could not be made contemplative so it would be an inappropriate location.

The E Street site is officially Walt Whitman Park. Although Walt Whitman worked for the nearby Department of Interior he was a poet and he was a nurse during the Civil War because he did not believe in killing. I don't really think any war memorial would be appropriate for this site.

Also, during Lady Bird Johnson's beautification program in the late 1960s, landscape architect Edward Durell Stone, Jr. did an excellent design for Walt Whitman Park that was reflective of the design of Rawlins Park with east/west rows of trees, walks, and pools. This was approved by all of the D.C. review agencies

but never constructed because of a lack of funding and is still appropriate.

As far as the 23rd and Constitution Avenue site, it is the preferred site. It provides a pedestrian accessible location in close proximity to the Mall with, as has been mentioned several times, a strong thematic connection to other 20th century war memorials such as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and future visitor's center, the Institute of Peace to the north, and the Lincoln Memorial to the south.

The site selection criteria has already been mentioned so I will just leave out some of what I was going to say and say that although an Army Corps of Engineers Potomac Park Levee will be located in this area in the future, there is an opportunity for possible landforms of the proposed memorial to be readily and effectively integrated within this.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Ms. Neal,

very much.

That ends the public comment period.

I will turn the matter to Mr. Shaw to resume.

[INSERT - WRITTEN STATEMENTS]

COMMISSIONER SHAW: Thank you. I really want to thank the Association. They are working with our design team right now to get context and really understand the story and what it means to be part of the city.

I'm excited about this site and opportunity but, and this sort of goes to the staff report, we've done so much work to think about the future of memorials that to hear about walls, walls, walls, roofs, walls, walls, circles, walls, power I'm not saying we need pink parrots. You know what I mean?

The idea right now is we went through a very exhaustive exercise to figure out how to commemorate the future. This is one of our most -- one of our new contemporary memorials. There's two things I would say.

One is, I'm not say go back to the drawing board but really sort of mine all that thinking that came from the NCPC on that. If you're not from D.C. walk around the African American Civil War Memorial. It's very beautiful

and fits into the context really well.

If you do decide to sort of build upon the history of memorials, please look at our comments on World War I and Eisenhower and the contemplative space for World War II.

A lot of these spaces I see look so familiar that we weighed in a lot of the Commission on those topologies and it would behoove you and your design team to sort of glean the ideas and the concerns that came from those as you think about this. I think you have so much meat to work with on this that I think you can do a lot of stuff and you have a great site. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Shaw.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm not sure if we're supposed to be focusing still on -- I guess both, the site and design, hand-in-glove. I'm not going to read this as the Belvedere site. We discussed that last time.

I wish the Smithsonian was here because I completely disagree with CFA's letter.

(Laughter.)

I can't think of a worst place for this memorial than the Belvedere, aside from everything else, why would you put it right on the water if it's Desert Storm?

(Laughter.)

I mean that makes no sense at all. So I would just like to associate myself with the full monty of Ms. Neal's letter which I thought was excellent and also yes, steer away from the walls, the walls, the walls.

What's in process for the Korean War Memorial and the naming wall seems awfully similar to some of this also, so I think you would find yourself as an also-ran in the neighborhood if you were to go with something that similar. And besides, you need to lower the walls to -- well, you need to lower any of the memorial's elements in this site because of the views that you would be blocking. But I'm still a big fan of this site. I think if nothing else, the schemes show it can be done and I will leave

it to Mr. Gallas to opine further.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I would love to.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: She has yielded the floor to you.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.

First, I want to acknowledge a well-written EDR. I think the kind of logic chain, the analysis of the three different sites is very thoughtful and found myself doing check, check, check, yes, I agree, yes, I agree. And so Site 3 is my focus at 23rd and Constitution.

It really is a symbolic location and a compelling one. That dotted line that's drawn that connects Vietnam to this site is quite remarkable. So much so that one of my observations is that there will be a procession of people who will go from the Vietnam War Memorial to the Desert Storm/Desert Shield Memorial. We will want that, absolutely, the connection back to the 20th century memorials and the people in our life time, too, are going to

see it. Let's hope it gets built in our life time.

But it does suggest that that line does suggest that people are probably going to make a goat path there. We have had to deal with this issue sometimes a lot about how -- like if the Banneker Memorial Park that we are redesigning, because of the goat paths that existed and the importance of embracing and maybe even expecting that people will travel, so to the extent the design can acknowledge some opening, some connection and that would be a physical connection in my mind. I don't know our purview. You can't necessarily sit here and go on recommending a walkway between those, but I mean the advantage that the Vietnam Memorial has is its direct access from the Mall. And so, there's a very nice progression that pedestrian has as it approaches the Vietnam War Memorial.

We're not going to quite have the same connections in the Mall, and so we have to think about what's going to happen and how will people

visit the site. So hopefully, you'll consider that as part of your design.

I do have a question as you get into the design about this area, there are a few mature trees in the picture that you've shown and so just also want to ask that you look at if trees are going to be removed or can they be removed, how do we want to think about that? So please be considerate of that as well.

And then as it relates to schemes one and two versus scheme three, I think that I like the location of schemes one and two, the location of schemes one and two, closer to 23rd Street as opposed to scheme three which seems to migrate further west, I guess that is. And I feel as though we lose something there in the cohesion of the relationship with the other 20th century memorials which is a really important and compelling strategy that you've espoused. So the closer to 23rd, in my mind, the better.

And Commissioner Shaw's commentary about the walls and Commissioner Wright, I

totally agree. I used some other more colorful words earlier about the walls, but I think that I was sitting here thinking, Mr. Shaw, about the World War I Memorial also. And if you would please go visit that while you're here in town. It's right on Pennsylvania Avenue, in a very prominent location. Yet no one goes there. And why? And you should ask yourselves why and have been spending time thinking about how do redesign that.

It's the anniversary of World War I and the walls don't really help us there to make people want to come here. And shouldn't that be part of this? Yes, we want to honor the people who fought and died in this war, absolutely, with all full respect. But at the same time, can't we do it in another way that doesn't prevent people from coming here? I mean, exactly, we want to be honest. So please, give us some thoughts as you come back and look at some of these other war memorials.

Clearly, the Vietnam War Memorial was

such a success in terms of the wall and the simplicity of it, but it also is sort of buried into the land. It dives in and therefore doesn't obstruct and still feels open and welcoming to visitors and it's been such a tremendously highly visited memorial that it's certainly compelling to want to think about oh, we need another wall. But I think there are plenty of other examples where it's not done so well where it's above the raised wall situation. And I just hope you'll take those comments into consideration.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Can you yield time back to me?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Can you do that?

(Laughter.)

I also want, I forgot my most -- another important point. And we talked a lot about this at NCMAC. It's de rigueur to feel a compulsion to list everyone's names. And I understand the impulse, but I think we lose something in being completely wedded to that

notion that first of all that memorializing without individual names is not meaningful somehow and I would argue that it is. And if you look around at some of what I think are the best memorials in Washington, they're abstract. And they invite contemplation that's not so literal.

And when you're bound to a literal typology, it does force you into a series of choices that have architectural expression that's pretty limited. So that's what I wanted to -- but maybe naming everyone is not necessarily the thing that has to be done with every memorial.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Ms. White.

COMMISSIONER WHITE: I think that's a really powerful comment and I was thinking and listening to the video with Secretary Baker, the theme of coalition in this country coming together to do this in unity and something that we need today pretty strongly or pretty badly.

So I think the idea of the walls being so static and flat and everything that my colleagues have said, I just wanted to reiterate

is there a different way to design it so that the people who go and engage with one another while they're in that space, because I think that's the power of these public spaces where everyone comes together and interacts with one another. So thinking about that theme of the coalition I think is really powerful.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Additional questions or comments, Mr. May?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: I was just going to, I guess, around with this wall discussion, for many of us, this wall, we just don't believe in walls. We're fighting walls all over the place, so please don't install walls. In fact, I think bridges may be better or coalitions as was mentioned, but please, no walls.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Cash.

COMMISSIONER CASH: I was going to comment, but just a quick comment because I think that the talk about what we have up here on the

screen and being careful which part of the site we take up. I think that -- maybe this sounds a little bit macabre, but a little bit of future proofing our Mall design when we're talking about granted this is the 20th century war kind of sites that we have, but we've already got kind of a 21st century war that's been going on close to 20 years that 20 years from now, someone is probably going to be coming back and looking for a site for that which again, not to be macabre, but when you look at the scale and length, somebody is probably going to be looking for a big site and the Mall is very limited, so I would just encourage as you're looking at all these other design elements to kind of take that into consideration that we've got a lot of constraints. There's not a lot of other room left on the Mall. We're only 250 years into the Republic and there might be a lot more space needed, so I would just keep that in the back of your mind in looking at this.

And I also wanted to say that there's

been a lot of talk about military parades in D.C. and I just kind of throw out this little factoid. The last time we had a military parade in D.C., it was 1991 after this war, and they apparently at that point decided not to walk down Pennsylvania, but they did Constitution and then down to the Memorial Bridge, so it would have actually gone I think pretty close to this site which I think is another item that kind of reinforces the context for this site being -- having some relevance.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Additional comments?

COMMISSIONER MAY: So I just want to say I appreciate everything that everyone has said and I agree with pretty much everything that has been said. I think this has been a very positive discussion. I do want to -- I do have a few sort of separate comments to make.

First of all, I do want to underscore, particularly the Association's efforts in this regard. This has been a learning experience going through it and not necessarily an easy one.

I'm accustomed to it. Mina and I are accustomed to it. But it is a difficult thing to learn and some people don't ever learn it and they try to battle their way to completion of a memorial and we find exactly the opposite. In some ways, it's reminiscent of a coalition building that happened in the conflict itself, that they're looking to build through friendship and cooperation and not try to duke it out. So I think that that's -- it's an important thing to note at this point.

I would also want to thank Ms. Neal for her comments. I appreciate that she's been watching this project all the way through and has been diligently coming to meetings and maybe sometimes like the only person coming to the meetings, but we certainly appreciate her efforts there.

I appreciate all the efforts of the staff and certainly I support the EDR for what it says. Of course, we do have this different conclusion from the Commission of Fine Arts. Toward that end, I want to assure the Commission

that I do not intend to send a letter to the Commission of Fine Arts.

(Laughter.)

I do not intend to have a meeting with the Chairman and the Secretary. We will return to the full Commission and work to refine concepts and try to come up with -- we'll try to convince them of the wisdom that this Commission has demonstrated so far.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: We're early in the process.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Early in the process. That's true. We have a ways to go.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make another comment, a historical note. I was part of ten people, that may not be believable, but we put together the whole Desert Storm Parade. I was with a bunch of guys who were led by a Three Star and I was one of the ten people under him and I helped do that. In fact, my responsibility was to one, help obviously with some of the city connections, but more to put

together the train of airplanes that came down the avenue. So we had a train that started in the Atlantic and, depending on the speed of the planes, we had to place them in place and it was a very interesting experience. But I'm not looking forward to another military parade.

(Laughter.)

Been there, done that.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So hearing no additional discussion, Mr. Rhodes of the Department of Defense, would you like the honor of making a motion?

COMMISSIONER RHODES: I certainly would. I'd like to make a motion to approve the EDR.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor, hearing nothing further, all in favor of the EDR as presented say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed no.

(No response.)

Excellent. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER RHODES: Mr. Chairman, it's indirectly related, but I think the point about the change in this nation's attitude towards our military after the divisive times of the Vietnam War is very valid. But I'm very proud of the fact that the Congress gave the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to lead a commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War, but the primary objective of thanking and honoring our Vietnam Veterans and their families for their service, valor, and sacrifice.

Two commemorative partners in local communities, regional, state, national, to include the NFL and Major League Baseball, I'm very proud to say that thus far over two million Vietnam-era Veterans have been individually and respectfully thanked and honored for their service. We're still working at it, but we've come a long way. So Thank you.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF

TRANSPORTATION, SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUADRANTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM I-295 SUITLAND PARKWAY INTERCHANGE TO P STREET, WASHINGTON, D.C. - SOUTH CAPITOL STREET CORRIDOR AND FREDERICK DOUGLASS MEMORIAL BRIDGE

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 5D is for the South Capitol Street Corridor and Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge.

Mr. Hart.

MR. HART: Good afternoon, everyone. And speaking of building bridges --

(Laughter.)

So while we're settling, I'll just let you know that being handed out now are two CFA letters for the projects from last year. I'll summarize them later in this presentation and also note there should be another letter or not a letter, but some comments that's at the desk in front of you from an individual, Terry Stratton, and the comments were received this week, a little earlier this week and we thought we would pass them on to you.

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. The District Department of Transportation has submitted a concept design for the South Capitol Street Corridor and a preliminary and final design for the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge for Commission review. This project was last before the Commission as a concept design in November of 2013.

As one of the major axial lines extending from the U.S. Capitol, South Capitol Street is one of the most important view sheds in the city. It connects to Suitland Parkway after crossing over the Anacostia River.

For a brief history, Suitland Parkway was originally constructed in the mid-1940s to provide a connection between the newly opened Andrews Air Force Base which is now known as Joint Base Andrews. You see it here in the bottom right hand part of this slide. And that connected the base with Washington, D.C.

And the parkway was soon converted to

a link to the city with the construction of the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge which opened in 1950.

An important view shed is seen here which is along the axis of South Capitol Street looking northward. This is the gateway to the Capitol. As you see -- you see this in its context with the National Stadium on the right hand side of the slide and some newly constructed residential units or building on the left hand side. And the Capitol is at the focal point.

Likewise, if you travel southbound looking at kind of the reverse way, you along South Capitol Street, you see the expanse of the Anacostia with the gateway leading to the neighborhoods on the east side of the Anacostia River. This is an important transition between these parts of D.C.

As South Capitol Street is one of the most symbolic gateways to the Capitol building, there have been several plans and studies over the last 20 years for this area.

In summary, these plans have envisioned this corridor as a wide boulevard with an open space component and a major national memorial at the end of South Capitol Street corridor where it connects to the bridge. Extending Legacy envisioned this terminus as a possible future home of the U.S. Supreme Court or major memorial.

In one of NCPC's more recent plans in 2005, we first introduced the idea of open spaces, one oval and one circle, on either side of the Anacostia and you can see this here in the image on the bottom left.

DDOT has submitted its proposal to redesign this corridor, which will be on the D.C. Government land under the control of DDOT. The project itself can be separated into distinct parts, the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge and the South Capitol Street corridor. The corridor can be further divided into a number of sub-elements including two, three-acre ovals, each with its own esplanade and the I-295 Suitland

Parkway interchange.

For this presentation, I'll be discussing the project components individually and will incorporate staff analysis along with the presentation to save some time.

So in 2013, DDOT was proposing this modest bridge design that's shown here with slightly arched spans and supported by 14 piers. The Commission action from 2013 stated that this was not an appropriate design response given its importance as a gateway for the city and its setting. Both CFA and NCPC were both encouraging DDOT to provide a grander experience for this bridge.

Following this concept review in 2013, DDOT took into consideration the NCPC-CFA comments and ultimately created an independent Aesthetic Review Committee, which consisted of representatives from NCPC, CFA, and the D.C. Historic Preservation Office.

DDOT, in conjunction with this committee, developed 15 over-arching goals for

the project as it began a competitive design process. This led to a current bridge design that staff believes is an elegant and iconic bridge response that is befitting its context.

This proposal that's before you includes the construction of a 1,145 foot long triple arched steel bridge with two concrete V piers that are designed to appear to spring over the water surface. It will replace the deteriorating existing bridge. The new triple-arched bridge will include six travel lanes for vehicles, a dedicated bike path, a pedestrian path, and four overlooks or belvederes. You'll see this in a bit more detail in the next few slides.

The bridge at its highest point is 160 feet above -- excuse me, 168 feet above the water's surface. The outer arches are about 20 feet shorter to give the central arch more prominence. The distance between the bottom of the bridge and the river's surface is 43 feet 3 inches and unlike the existing bridge, it will

not open. This decision not to open the bridge was made several years ago and also allows it to be built in close proximity to the existing bridge.

The image on the left, you can see the north bound travel lanes, a detailed perspective drawing, with the pedestrian and separated bike paths on the right-hand side of the image. You can also see one of the four overlooks or belvederes that have been incorporated into the design. This is in that same left-hand side image. These belvederes will afford people who cross the bridge sweeping views up and down the Anacostia River.

The pedestrian pathway, which is eight feet wide, and the two-way bike lane will be an additional ten feet wide. They will be on both sides of the river and connect to the trail network.

Staff is very supportive of this design and finds that the revised design with three piers of large arches, excuse me, three

pairs of large arches, up to 168 feet in height and multi-mobile transportation elements is a strong, elegant design that distinguishes the bridge from the 11 other bridges in the District. Therefore, we recommend that the Commission approve the preliminary and final site plans for a new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge.

Staff had some comment about the night time view that was included with the proposal. These comments are twofold. The first is about the project's impact on longer views, especially to the U.S. Capitol, while the second concerns cumulative impacts of all of the Potomac and Anacostia Bridge lighting on views to the Monumental Core.

The first concern about bridge lighting is about the impact of this project on views to the Capitol. You can see this rendering here actually includes the new bridge, kind of super imposed in the image. You can see this view is actually from St. Elizabeth's Campus, the point which is a federal facility.

Light intensity, light color and the location of this bridge is a potential concern because of the prominence of the bridge along the South Capitol Street corridor and its proximity to the Capitol itself.

DDOT states that it recognizes the potential impacts of this bridge and it is proposing to develop an operational agreement for bridge lighting. Staff is supportive of this and reminds that DDOT should include NCPC, CFA, and the D.C. Historic Preservation Office in that discussion.

The second issue concerns the cumulative impacts of bridge lighting. Recently, DDOT has either requested or installed special lighting on several bridges along the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers including this project, including this area. Staff is supportive of artificial lighting in general, however, we believe that since DDOT has proposed architectural lighting on a number of bridges, that there should be some coordination on what is

appropriate in order to more fully understand what the impact might be of the Monumental Core. Therefore, staff recommends that DDOT develop an overall lighting plan for all of the Potomac and Anacostia River bridges that analyzes the cumulative effects of bridge lighting on natural systems and larger views of the Monumental Core.

Now I'll move to the South Capitol Street corridor component of the project which includes the east and west ovals and the I-295 Suitland Parkway interchange. There are multiple gateways, sequences that dignitaries, visitors, and residents will encounter as they move through this area, creating a specific design response that acknowledges that the different conditions on both sides of the bridge is very important to emphasize the connectivity that this bridge represents, both physically and visually.

First, I'll discuss the components of east of the river and then I'll move to the west side. Here is the 2013 concept design of the east oval. The east oval, as I noted, will be

just around three acres in size. As I noted earlier, the east oval is the first opportunity in the sequence of park spaces that frame the bridge and mark the entrance of the South Capitol Street gateway to the U.S. Capitol.

DDOT states that this oval, which is on D.C. land is surrounded by federal land as it borders Poplar Point, Anacostia Park, and under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and low-density development at Joint Base Anacostia Bolling under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. As such, the setting of this east oval will be less urban and more natural with some low-density development. The only exception to this is the portion of Poplar Point that will likely be transferred to the D.C. Government and that will become the only developable parcels for the private sector and this area is just to the east and southeast of the oval.

This is the oval in more detail. There is a more passive quality to this oval with more open grassy areas, meadows, and a few

meandering pathways.

DDOT included their analysis for the east oval. You'll see these diagrams that show different systems and relationships from pedestrian, bikes, and cars to stormwater, natural systems, landscaping and topography. As a side note for this image which is the pedestrian circulation, the access from the west seems appropriate. The connections from the east where the future Poplar Point redevelopment will be located needs to be strengthened. Staff would therefore request that DDOT explore a direct pedestrian-bicycle connection to the northeast from the oval and they are proposing a traffic island there and we are just suggesting that they connect to that.

DDOT also provided a few slides showing the design intent for this oval. These images depict a passive location with pathways, less formal plantings, and furniture and possibly a memorial. And I'll just note that this is the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge and that

Frederick Douglass' life really hasn't been incorporated into the design in either the east or west oval and staff recommends that DDOT explore incorporating elements that describe the life and legacy of Frederick Douglass into the esplanade areas or the ovals.

So DDOT also provided some renderings of the project as well. Here are a few ideas that showed what the esplanade might look like and this is -- the esplanade is on the left hand side of the slide. There is also a pedestrian connection through the oval and incorporating what appears to be a stormwater management area. DDOT hasn't provided stormwater management information on the project since it's still at concept design. As this is a large site which will need to address stormwater management and is located next to a sensitive waterway, staff is interested on information on how DDOT will meet the District Department of Energy and the Environment requirements for stormwater management.

Staff understands that there is a great potential for this space, although it is at the concept level. DDOT should continue to work on this park design to ensure it's treated with the same importance as the west oval, although it is distinctly different.

Staff finds that given its passive setting located adjacent to Poplar Point and the wooded areas of Suitland Parkway and it's outside the direct views to the U.S. Capitol, the east oval presents an opportunity for more dramatic gateway elements such as the national or local memorial or public art to distinguish the oval from nearby open space.

Staff therefore requests that the future design consider how the east oval could better accommodate both visitors and residents by incorporating design elements such as a national memorial, local memorial, or public art in a way that serves this dual role as a gateway to both the U.S. Capitol and the neighborhoods east of the river.

Next we move -- finally, I'll get to the I-295 interchange with Suitland Parkway which is the other portion of the property that's east of the river. Unfortunately, there wasn't much information on this regarding the landscaping, signage, lighting given this project is still in the earlier stage. Staff would request that DDOT provide a lighting and signage plan to better understand the project and this is necessary to ensure that these elements are coordinated and work well together.

Next, we move to the west oval and in 2013, the Commission action was in general support for the ovals themselves and DDOT has provided additional information on the west oval design.

As I noted earlier, this area has been the focus of a number of planning documents. Most of these planning documents acknowledge that this area was special and important and in NCPC's plans assumed much of it would be under federal ownership. Staff continues to believe the

importance of this area, but also acknowledges that it is a changing neighborhood with the introduction of two sports venues with Nationals Park and the soon to be finished DC United Stadium, the arts development, and improved connections to the Anacostia River.

As this area evolves, a memorial will need to be placed that balances this new reality with the prominence that the oval due south of the U.S. Capitol. Therefore, staff notes that while several NCPC plans and studies proposed a major memorial for the west oval due to its axial relationship with the U.S. Capitol, the area surrounding the oval has substantially changed over the last decade into a more vibrant district area or neighborhood which will require a memorial that is both compatible in program and design with surrounding uses and the intent to use this space as an urban park.

Since 2013, DDOT embarked on a redesign of the west oval and has provided these images for inspiration included spaces for active

play, a farmers market, passive sitting, and open lawns. Given that this area has seen a tremendous amount of redevelopment including residential, office, and retail uses nearby, staff supports the proposed concept to use the west oval as an active park or gathering space for visitors and residents.

As with the east oval, the applicant has provided some diagrams it used to understand to make decisions about the design and they're shown in this slide. DDOT has also provided some images of the west oval, some prospective renderings with a possible farmers market, you see here in the bottom left hand side and the west esplanade which is the upper image.

DDOT states that the west oval will be a formal urban park with pedestrian access points on each end. There are two main axes that move through the site. The north-site axis which follows the North Capitol Street and the northeast-southwest axis along Potomac Avenue.

The main visual connection is north-

south because of the relationship of the park with the U.S. Capitol Building to the north as I mentioned a number of times already. Trees, pathways, and open spaces are oriented in this fashion to reinforce this relationship. A memorial or public art piece should respect this axis as well as the uses as an urban park given this evolving neighborhood around the site.

Therefore, staff finds that given the size of the three acre oval, a gateway element such as a major memorial or public art installation can still be appropriate. However, unlike the east oval, the focal point of the west oval should continue to be the U.S. Capitol, which serves as a background or backdrop to this public space. And staff also requests that the future designs consider how the west oval could accommodate gateway elements such as a memorial or public art and show them at different scales.

While the north-south axis is important visually, the northeast-southwest axial connection is important for pedestrian flow

through the oval from the Nationals Stadium as you see identified here, and points east to the soon to be completed D.C. United Stadium which is west of South Capitol Street. And DDOT has provided a sidewalk through this site to delineate this connection. And staff understands that this site, this is where the connection is. The cartway -- the area where the actual roadway is different -- that width is different on both sides and it just presents somewhat of a challenge and you see the areas identified by the dotted lines are the size that the cartway should be if they use the side that's on the east of the oval.

Staff finds that the varying cartway widths of Potomac Avenue, the pedestrian crossings, and the diagonal sidewalk do not provide a sufficient design response to delineate this important cartway and pedestrian caption.

So in conclusion, the staff is appreciative of the work that DDOT has put into this project over the past few years and is --

and believes that the bridge design has significantly improved and is recommending approval of the preliminary and final design of the bridge. Regarding the corridor itself, we are providing some comments to provide additional information on the design of the landscape elements associated with the South Capitol Street corridor and is looking forward to working with DDOT as the project is submitted for future review.

So with that, it is the Executive Director's recommendation that the Commission note DDOT is seeking preliminary and final approval of the bridge and comments of the corridor concept design, that the corridor is a symbolic gateway to the Capitol and home to an evolving high-density neighborhood and that this is an opportunity to connect both sides of the river.

Regarding the bridge, approve the preliminary and final design for the bridge which is a strong, elegant design that would

distinguish it from the other D.C. bridges and note that the applicant responded to the NCPC November 13th Commission comments.

Also, regarding the bridge, that the arches' lighting could impact views to the U.S. Capitol from the topographic bowl and that DDOT notes it will develop an agreement to determine acceptable operating parameters for the lighting.

Staff requests DDOT include NCPC, CFA, and the DC SHPO to develop the agreement and also notes that there would be cumulative impacts from the bridge lighting and recommends that DDOT develop an overall lighting agreement for all of the 11 bridges.

Regarding the east overlays, the gateway between two parts of D.C., finds that this is a passive setting outside of District views of the Capitol that might be appropriate. Our far more dramatic gateway element requests the future design consider how it would accommodate visitors and residents, requests that DDOT explore a direct connection to the northeast

which needs to be strengthened.

Regarding the west oval, most of this neighborhood has changed over the last 20 years and that a memorial has to be compatible with surrounding uses and the park as an urban space, supports the concept to use overlay as an active space for residents and visitors, finds that a memorial or art piece can be appropriate, but has to respect the context which is south of the U.S. Capitol and requests that the future designs show how it can accommodate a gateway element at various scales.

Also, for the west oval, note that there are two important axes, north to the U.S. Capitol and the northeast-southwest along Potomac Avenue finds that the South Capitol Street axis is strong, but the Potomac Avenue axis is less successful and requests that DDOT explore options to strengthen this connection.

And finally, some overall comments, staff recommends that DDOT explore ways of celebrating Frederick Douglass in the esplanades

and ovals, requests a lighting and signage plans for the ovals and all roadway and pathway and interpretive signs, and finally requests information on how it will meet the DOEE stormwater management requirements.

And finally, DDOT has presented the project to CFA I guess twice last year in October and November. You have the letters that are before you. In October 2017, DDOT presented the bridge project and surrounding landscapes to CFA and the Commission, at that time, questioned the appropriateness of the bridge design. They raised concerns that it may not fit with the context of the area and the bridge topology in Washington and to better understand the proposal, CFA requested additional views of the bridge within the broader contexts of the D.C. river bridges, the Anacostia waterfront, the riverfront, the baseball stadium and the city skyline.

In November of last year, DDOT responded by providing a more extensive

presentation on the broader context using the visuals that illustrate the additional views which is what I presented earlier. CFA endorsed the bridge concept design with the comments that I provided in the staff report and asked that the design team continue to refine the properties of the arches themselves.

Regarding the landscape, CFA recommended more robust connections from the ovals and from the walks from the Anacostia and that the designs were diagrammatic and lacking conceptual clarity. Staff would be supportive of these comments.

And that would conclude my presentation and I'm available to answer any questions. Representatives from DDOT are here as well.

[INSERT - FREDERICK DOUGLAS MEMORIAL BRIDGE]

[INSERT - WRITTEN STATEMETNS]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Hart, very much.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't be more excited about a bridge over troubled waters, waters that are going to be cleaned up soon and a bridge that's going to help bring some communities together more easily.

I also am so happy that we are now finally recognizing Frederick Douglass for his great works. They are current. I mean some of us thought it was current, but I know of his past works.

(Laughter.)

I would like to just encourage the lighting and the bridge and the park.

I feel a little bit uncomfortable because it's like I have conflict of interest. My house is like four blocks from the east side of this bridge. I've walked across the bridges there many times, so it's going to be a great improvement. I know the Commission members here will come up with some good ideas to tweak it

maybe, but I guess it's really something to look forward to. I hope I'm around to see it. I think I will be. But thanks to the staff for its work, and thanks to DDOT, too, for its work.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Shaw.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: I want to thank you for all your work as well, and I just want to note that DDOT, DOEE, and Office of Planning submitted the Budget Point Vision Framework which details significantly a lot of the work and programming for particularly the west oval and so this is one of those moments I wish all of us could sing and dance together, you know. If we're a trio, you know -- but a lot of the thinking that has gone through there has been recognized and articulated. This place is growing faster than even you guys can think about. On the west and the east, and I would appreciate the conversation on the east oval because as we began to think about the planning for Poplar Point, I feel like this is a direction more to the Office of Planning, that is DDOT's as

we think about the scoping of that project.

But I just want to highlight in particular, I'm also working closely with DDOT to address the concerns raised by CFA, as well, and I think we're going back to them at some moment, to provide those comments. And I also want to note that the underwalk of the west oval, the Anacostia Riverwalk, was actually a consortium of all of the property owners, along the west side, who all agreed to give up an easement and to pay as we develop to create that riverwalk.

This really is -- I won't call it a private gift, but, a little bit of cajoling, but it really was a strong collaboration between DDOT, OP, and the private landowners, on making sure we can get that walkability under the bridge and along the water done.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Cash?

COMMISSIONER CASH: First, I just want to reiterate everything that Director Shaw said. I think that the process has been great.

Personally, being a lay person when it

comes to things like this, I think the design looks great. I do just want to ask a question, I don't know, of Mr. Shaw or DDOT. When is groundbreaking on this project, and when will we actually have equipment out there working on this?

MR. LYTLE: So, I can answer that question for you right now.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Can you introduce yourself?

MR. LYTLE: I'm sorry. I'm Delmar Lytle, Program Manager for the District Department of Transportation. So, we had the groundbreaking for the project in February.

So we're doing more preliminary work now. We hope to have the bridge open, substantial completion, no later than the end of 2021.

COMMISSIONER CASH: Thanks. I'll just say again, it was a process question. I've noted this before. With some District projects, they come to us for final design review after they've

already started. I mean, it's just one of those things I would hope that the District can do a better job of getting it to this point, as maybe had we hated and turned it down, we would already have had a bunch of pylons being driver into the river.

(Laughter.)

Just, again, again, everything else, I think it's been -- the project, other than that, has been a great collaboration. So, I congratulate you.

MR. LYTLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. May, and then Mr. Gallas?

COMMISSIONER MAY: So I'm glad you raised that point, Mr. Cash. That was one of the concerns that I had, having to do with, you know, seeing this, in this state, essentially for the first time, in granting a final approval for the design, and I don't have total confidence that the design really is final.

And I guess maybe this is a question,

and again, it goes back to CFA and their comments. Because although the November letter is much better than the October letter, which was, if I had gotten the October letter, I'd be crying myself to sleep, but somehow, in less than a month, they managed to fix an awful lot.

That's pretty remarkable. Maybe there was a meeting. I don't know. But I won't go into that. But I think there's some risk here, isn't there? What if there actually is further review by CFA, and it changes? Do we have to -- would we have to reconsider it?

So, I guess my first question is, for Mr. Lytle, if you don't mind, what is the plan, at this point, to address the comments? Because you have a concept approval from CFA, not a final, as I understand it. And they asked for further refinement of the proportions of the arches, and things like that, which is a pretty substantive thing.

If we were just talking about, you know, paint colors, it wouldn't be an issue, from

my perspective on this Commission. But what are you going to do to respond to that?

MR. LYTLE: So, we are responding to CFA. We met with staff, and we have been meeting with staff ever since, in November.

What was determined in the meeting with staff is that we go in, since we have the concept approval, to go and show basically, you know, like in math, show your work, to show how we looked at it, and show the relationship as it relates to the FAA restriction as it relates to the height of the arch that it can be, and then also spanning a federal channel, and the constraints that we have for design, construction that way.

And so it's been determined that moving forward, that we show the map with that, and then go in, and show the overall landscaping and programming of the oval. So that's what we're doing now.

Moving forward, getting the preliminary and final approval of the bridge, so

that we can still move forward with the oval, so that when we go to CFA, for the next time that we show them, we addressed your comments as relates to the arches, that you wanted to see exactly why the arches could not be higher or more contrasting. I can't remember the exact wording that they said.

But we've been meeting with staff to address that. And then also going to CFA to show them what we're doing with the ovals as well.

We're also in a process, we're still meeting with them, as well. And moving forward, we're doing with the consulting parties as well, everything associated with the ovals and things of that nature.

But we do have concept approval, and we have been moving forward with that concept approval, and still meeting with staff.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. I understand the process of meeting with staff. We do that all the time as well. But the comment was, refine the proportions of the arches,

particularly by further lowering the profile of the outer pairs of arches in relation to those at the center.

So are you actually studying changing the profiles --

MR. LYTLE: So we changed those. We changed those to 20 feet, and that's as far as they can lower down, because of the structural forces that you have --

COMMISSIONER MAY: What we have in our report is not what CFA has reviewed.

MR. LYTLE: CFA has seen the initial, but the full Commission, has not.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MR. LYTLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. We've not seen what we're approving here.

MR. HART: There were some changes between -- since CFA saw this in November.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MR. HART: There have been some changes to the design, and I think that's what --

COMMISSIONER MAY: And we're fairly confident that it's not going to change any further. Well, I know you're fairly confident, but I'm --

(Laughter.)

I'm also concerned about our approvals.

MR. HART: Yes. And I mean, honestly, we have always told applicants that if there are changes, they should be coming, and they are significant, that they should be coming back to us.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Because that's one of the things, again, just going to process, it was very uncomfortable looking at this and thinking that we have -- we don't have necessarily clarity on what CFA's going to approve, and at the same time, we're trying to give a final approval to the bridge design. But I feel a little bit better having talked through that, and knowing that, of course, we'd have to come back a revision, if that's necessary.

So the next question that I have is can we actually bring up that view from the Point? Okay, so we don't actually have a view of that at night, do we?

Okay. And I think --

(Laughter.)

Okay, yeah, put the bridge in. All right.

MR. HART: This is all -- Mr. Commissioner May, this is also why we're looking at having more kind of dialogue about the lighting issues.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. And I think that's why I have a concern. Because while -- I mean, this, I think this is a fairly sympathetic rendering of the bridge, in terms of the color of it, and the profile.

Well, first of all, this is the current version of the bridge, with the outer arches as low as possible?

MR. HART: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Because it's

-- it is fairly imposing, and I think that it's -- I can be comfortable with this in the daytime, but when it's lit at night, if it's lit up as brightly as some of the other images that we saw, I think it could be really problematic. And I just think, because we don't want to create large bright shiny things in the foreground of the Capital.

And I think that's just where my concern is. So, my next -- I guess this is also a process question, is that we talked about having to manage the lighting, and develop a management plan, and please don't tell me they're going to do color on this one, either, but the -- how -- I mean, is the Commission itself going to be able to approve what that plan is? Because I feel like we have to.

MR. HART: We can do that. I mean, they still have to come in with the rest of the project design. But I understand, what the question is, when do they come in?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. I mean, I

feel like we have to see the lighting and approve the lighting. Is that -- I mean, am I being -- I don't know, I mean, that was just my reaction to it.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, you are being that way, but it's appropriate.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Why, thank you.

(Laughter.)

So much agreement today.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I know, I know, I know. We need to go and take some pills.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So, all right, I'm not sure exactly how we accomplish that, but I think that's an issue that we certainly ought to be considering. I'm going to put aside the fact that these are not actually ovals from a geometry perspective. I have to say that every single time. I can't give it up, but anyway.

I do appreciate the progress that's been made on this, and I do also believe we need to see a lot more development on the design of

the ovals, because what I've seen so far is kind of a -- it's an odd mixture of things, and I'm looking forward to -- I'm not expecting great things at this moment, or a fully finished design, but I feel like we're going to have to look at that very carefully, and certainly, the Commission of Fine Arts, which is just loaded with landscape architects, is going to have a lot to say about that as well.

I think that's the end of my comments. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Thank you. I have a bridge design question and concern.

Could we go -- Mr. Hart, could we go to slide 11, please?

This has to do with the width of the pedestrian pathway, which I think you said, you said it quick, but eight feet is what I think I heard. And I don't know how many of us have been across the Brooklyn Bridge as a pedestrian, but -- and I'd like to know how wide the Brooklyn

Bridge is, the pedestrian walk.

I know it's only one-sided, and this will be two-sided, but I can tell you that there's great conflict between the bikes and the pedestrians on that bridge. And if we're inviting this idea of, let's walk across, come on down, right, which I think is what we're trying to do here, I'm worried about eight feet. I am very worried about eight feet.

I don't know what -- I'm not a expert on this, but I don't know how much thought and study has gone into that dimension. I understand the bike path, ten feet, I get that, five and five, that works, we do that all day long.

But there's also, you know, no separation. And I know these bikers like to move quickly in these kinds of settings. They're moving fast, and every time I've been -- and I've been across the Brooklyn Bridge a half a dozen times, and every time, there are conflicts between the bikers and the pedestrians.

And I know New York's more, you know,

greater population, and so maybe it's not apropos at all. But I think we would all be -- I'm not always for more is better, believe me. I'm not. But I'm very worried that we're designing something now that may not work.

So, in the sense that we've got a design that we're sitting here approving, I'm very concerned about this in the EDR. I don't know, what research has been done to determine that eight feet works.

MR. LYTLE: So, as it relates to pedestrian paths and widths and everything, for the most part, we just went by the AASHTO, which, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines, as it relates to pedestrian and bicycle movements. So, with that, AASHTO recommends that for pedestrian movements, the minimum width would be six feet, and the minimum width for bicycle paths would be eight feet.

So looking at that, and looking at the bicycle and the pedestrian traffic that we

anticipate will use the bridge, we went ahead and increased both of those by two additional feet, to provide the additional width of eight feet for the pedestrian path, and then ten feet for the bicycle path as well.

The comment related to there needs to be a separation between the two, that's something that we've heard on multiple levels that we're investigating right now, to see if there's any type of delineation we can make to make sure that there's no crossing of the path, whether that be colored concrete, or something else outside of a stripe, or if there needs to be some kind of physical separation.

But that is something that we're looking at, and something we're considering as well. But we did increase the minimum width by two feet for both the pedestrian path and also the bicycle path, because of the anticipated traffic on the bridge.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Well, I don't think AASHTO necessarily wins me over,

personally.

(Laughter.)

These are folks that don't necessarily advocate for pedestrians or bikes, for that matter, as far as I'm concerned.

And I think that while we see the opportunity for these pathways to be on both sides of the bridge, which I think certainly does offer sort of a hope that there will be equally distribution of people across, we can, I'm sure, anticipate people going both ways on both sides as pedestrians on this bridge, right?

So, does anybody -- has anybody looked at, say, the amount of people we might anticipate in this setting, so that we can handle, you know, eight feet? If two people are walking side by side, that's like almost two people going each way, almost two people going each way. And there are going to be conflicts in there.

So I'm very, very worried about this. I'd like to recommend that the EDR acknowledge this as a concern.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So you're proposing an amendment to --

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Yes, I am. I'm not the right person to write it, but I am proposing it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: If I could say, I think I agree that having some sort of physical separation is important, even, you know, color doesn't -- different colored surfaces don't do enough, and it might be the sort of case where some sort of barrier makes sense. Because pedestrians will wander. I mean, the cyclists tend to stay in line, but they also tend to move at higher speed. And I just think that there's something to be said for that.

As for eight feet, yeah, I mean, at the moment it is hard to imagine that this is going to be as popular as walking across the Brooklyn Bridge, in the immediate future. But given all the development potential on both sides, I think that actually is a really legitimate concern, because I mean the Brooklyn

Bridge was built more than 100 years ago, so, even 20 years from now, there will be a lot more development, and a lot more people walking across.

So I think it's a real question. By today's standards, I think it makes sense, but looking into the future, I think it's a real question. Of course, in the future, we'll probably need less lanes for cars, right?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: True, but that won't help us here, because the cars aren't going to be sharing with pedestrians.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, no, eliminate -- just eliminate a vehicle lane.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Sure. And then you walk across this bridge. Which is going to be my next topic, about the ovals, but we'll get to that.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So if you were going to wordsmith something, on page three, under the Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge, after the first finds, where it says, finds that the

revised design with three pairs of large arches, etcetera, make a new note there, that's probably the perfect place to put it, note some concern about the width of pedestrian bicycle path conflicts or something. You can work on that while we continue to --

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I have a couple of other things.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Resume.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. KOSTER: To note the concern, or to request that they return to the Commission with more information?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I think we need to have more information. You know, this is a final approval. I guess you all saw it in 2013, but I wasn't even born then.

(Laughter.)

But --

MS. KOSTER: Plus the light. Could we bundle, and ask to see the lighting design, too?

Or delegate it to staff, or something? But it has to be looked at.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would like to have it come back to the full Commission, but you could still give a final approval with an exception, right? Or conditions, or something like that?

MR. LYTLE: Commissioners, if I may, right now we're intending to be coming back, because we do not yet even have an operational agreement with all our consulting parties related to the lighting. So that is something that we know is an unknown at this time, that we have to come back to, and that we are committed to coming back and showing that preliminary and final, as it relates to the programming of the ovals, and the other illustrations related to Frederick Douglass and celebrating his life.

Thanks to my super team that I have back here with me, they just informed me that the Brooklyn Bridge is only one path that is shared use. It's not separated. Where here, we're

giving the separation between the bicycles and pedestrians, where Brooklyn Bridge is just the 12 feet is just basically a free-for-all, which we don't have here.

COMMISSIONER WHITE: May I comment here, since that's sort of my life right now, is building a trail system in Houston? Our width is ten feet, on a multi-use trail. In Chicago, we built 14 feet on an elevated structure with only 30 feet of right-of-way, and the rest was landscaping. So I think that, thinking of the space, I think it's more of identifying where people should be. But I think's good to come back and show us that you've thought that through, and put in places where you could reduce the conflict.

You could have one side be cyclists only, and one for pedestrians only. There's all kinds of ways, but I think it's an important thing to address. But I think they have the space to do it right. That's my assessment.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I think it seems

like part of it would involve what the kind of volume of people we're expecting might travel across this. And I take up two feet. I know that. I'm sitting over two feet right now. So if I'm walking with someone --

COMMISSIONER WHITE: If you want to walk besides someone.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: And then two people are coming the other way, we're busted, and if there's a stroller, and there are kids running around, and all of that. So, anyway.

MR. LYTLE: If I may, I would also just like to add that with that, as it relates to the widths and things of that nature, that's something that really can be worked out with the landscaping as we look at the coordination between the ovals and the pedestrian paths that we have right now. Ultimately, the width that you see on to the bridge, or from the railing to the edge of the parapet of 18 feet, that's going to remain the same, no matter what.

So we can do the programming as to

what takes place in that 18 feet, as we present and look forward, with the other oval programming and things of that nature. But that overall width is going to stay the same on the bridge, regardless of whether it's shared-use, multi-use, one sides goes for bicycles, one side goes for pedestrians, all of that can be worked out as we do the landscaping. But the width itself of 18 feet is what's going to remain the same.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Do you want to continue, and I'll --

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Yeah, I do.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: We've got about, by my account, about 45 minutes left, and we've got two more items to go.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Yeah. I'll try to go quickly. Yeah, so I'm very concerned about the ovals as it relates to encouraging pedestrian activity in these ovals. So if you go to either 18 or 30, you know, I don't know how people are going to get across.

I've actually walked this area by

Poplar Point, and it's like a murder/suicide mission. Cars are moving very fast through here. I don't know, do we -- I guess we're going to see signalized intersections at some locations, so maybe that is going to help us understand this better.

But I just ask you, as you look at that, especially the one, even on the west side, are we going to be encouraging people in that oval? The parks are showing kids and picnics, and soccer and all of that, and you know, I just, give you an example, the L'Arc de Triumph in Paris, if you try to cross there, you take your life into your hands. Yet it's something we're inviting people to do. But a signalized crosswalk could convince me otherwise, and I'd like to learn more about that.

And then the last one is the esplanade that Commissioner Shaw is very proud of. Again, I want to note here a safety concern or question. You know, this is sort of going to be a blind area, maybe, underneath that bridge. And we just

need to make sure it's going to well lit.

The width of the bridge is how wide, total?

MR. LYTLE: 168.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: 168?

MR. LYTLE: I can't remember.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: So you've got to be able to see to the other side, and see that it's safe on the other side, as you begin to cross that. So it's just a safety concern I'd like you to please consider. Thank you.

MR. LYTLE: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Other questions, comments? Do we have an amendment to report?

MS. KOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I have two.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Or in concept? Yes.

MS. KOSTER: Hold on just a minute. Some days I cannot read my own handwriting. I'll work on that.

MR. LYTLE: I've been there.

MS. KOSTER: The first is, on page three, in the section addressing the lighting,

requires the District Department of Transportation to submit the operational lighting agreement for Commission review. Would that --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I mean I think it's more than just the agreement. I think we want to see renderings of the actual lighting. So the lighting plan and operational agreement.

MS. KOSTER: Okay. So that requires DDOT to submit the lighting plan and operational lighting agreement for Commission review?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. That works.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: A motion on that?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would move that amendment.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of that amendment, say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

No?

COMMISSIONER SHAW: No.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: One no. Okay.

Second?

MS. KOSTER: The second one, it gets worse from a handwriting perspective, requires that the District Department of Transportation provide more detailed information regarding the pedestrian bicycle area that addresses anticipated volumes and potential conflicts.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I'll accept that.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Any comment on that amendment?

Hearing none, is there a motion on the amendment?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of that amendment, say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed, no?

(No response.)

Unanimous.

Any further discussion on the EDR?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded the EDR's amendment be passed. All in favor of the EDR's amendment, say aye?

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed, no?

(No response.)

Great. Thank you. This is an important project.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: It is beautiful.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It is.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Congrats.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And so much better than 2013.

MR. LYTLE: Thank you.

EVENTS DC, 801 MOUNT VERNON PLACE, NW, WALTER E. WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AND STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you. Agenda item 5E is the concept design for exterior

alterations and streetscape improvements to the Walter E. Washington Center. We have Mr. Webb.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, Mr. May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Once again, for the purposes of trying to expedite the meeting, I'm wondering if we need to see the presentation. I understand some people might, but so that's why I'm just asking. If anybody wants to see it, I'm fine with it.

[INSERT - WALTER E. WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Did anyone come prepared with detailed questions or comments or concerns on this project?

Mr. Cash?

COMMISSIONER CASH: I'm going to have a couple of concerns and a possible amendment --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CASH: -- but I don't think that it -- it's related just to the lighting. But I don't think that's necessary to run through the whole presentation.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Let's go ahead and pull up the presentation, and maybe when you get to your comments or questions, we could, if necessary, we'll have a visual aid.

Does anyone else have questions or comments of substance?

Mr. Shaw?

COMMISSIONER SHAW: I've got some questions.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Okay. Okay. Well, we'll skip the presentation.

MEMBER WHITE: It's beautiful.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So, Mr. Cash, you want to --

COMMISSIONER CASH: Yes, I just want to start -- maybe because we've had so much time here to sit and look at this stuff with everything else going on, but it kind of struck me, because we've been talking about lighting with a lot of other projects, that this is a very different project. It's one of those D.C.-centric things that kind of gets to me.

So, there was more comment in the EDR on lighting for this project than there was for the bridge project, or I think than we've had for some other projects. And this is a D.C. building, in a D.C. neighborhood, with no viewsheds of the Capitol. And yet, the comments say that there should be a study on lighting and how it affects residential units, which is only a block worth of people.

So, overall, my concern is that NCPC,

I understand there's jurisdiction over District buildings in the downtown area, but this seems so outside of the scope of what NCPC and the Federal Government should care about, given that there's no impact on views of the Capitol, or views of kind of the river, which I guess you would say is a more federal element. But, specifically, I was concerned on page 3, there's a request that Events DC provide additional information regarding the proposed lighting, and including colors, which we all love, in addition to the evaluation of the impact on residential areas, blah blah blah.

I feel like the wording there, saying the evaluation of the impacts on residential areas, kind of pre-determines that the National Capital Planning Commission thinks that any kind of lighting might be offensive to the residential neighbors in that neighborhood, yet we have an ANC process, we have a Historic Preservation Office process, given this is adjacent to a historic neighborhood.

So I just have an amendment that I'd like to see if people would be interested in doing just to kind of soften that language a little bit. Because I think that there is value to getting the lighting comments, but I would like to see us maybe not pre-dispose that, just because I don't think the Commission has that much of an interest in the lighting around here, given that it's maybe on the front end on the Mount Vernon side, but definitely not on the other side.

So, I was just going to say that we should insert an extra little clause, so it would say, request Events DC provide additional information regarding the proposed lighting, including color selections, in addition to the evaluation of the -- and this would be the insertion --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Sorry, where?

COMMISSIONER CASH: Sorry, page three, the second paragraph, requests?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Which line in that

paragraph?

COMMISSIONER CASH: So the third line of that, where it says, an evaluation of the impacts right now.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CASH: And I would suggest that it says, an evaluation of the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and area, including the impacts.

I think that the concept of compatibility with the area and neighborhood is a little less leaning on the side of, there's going to be an impact to, literally, there's one block of residential adjacent to the Convention Center, which is not conveyed in this at all, so, I just think that kind of -- hopefully it will give a better report back to the Commission and to the community when those final decisions are made. So, I would just ask that.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Does anyone have concerns about the amendment?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No concerns, just

a comment. I mean, I'm perfectly supportive of that comment. I think that one of the areas where we need to recall the history of NCPC is on issues like the lighting at the -- what is it called now, Capital One Arena, right? And that whole light display, and you know, the brightness associated with that.

I mean, I don't see anything here that's proposed that's anywhere close to that, but it was quite controversial, and we did have a number of neighbors coming to us, coming to this Commission, with concerns about it, and it is a D.C. building in the central area. And so, you know, there's clearly jurisdiction over it, and it's not limited to sort of, view shed of the Capitol. I mean, that, but there, that was like, the thing was going off and lighting up everything for blocks.

I don't think we have that circumstance here, but I think that's kind of where some of the sensitivity comes from. I think this is a fine amendment.

COMMISSIONER CASH: And that just reminds me of a second point that I wanted to make, too, that especially along the 7th Street side, there's a lot of redevelopment going on, opposite of the Convention Center, and I would actually have a greater fear that we keep the Convention Center kind of dark and uninviting, with a bunch of ground-level empty retail right now, and have an activated other side of the street.

And I just want to say, with Chinatown, I thought about that, too, earlier, and I understand with the basketball arena, but every other commercial property that goes in there right next door to that is allowed to do it by right to the extent they can, under D.C. laws. So, but I definitely did think of that, too. But I just want to make sure that we're not falling behind while the neighborhood kind of moves forward.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: And Mr. Chairman, I want to note that both sides are subject to OP

review, so we sign off on that as well.

And I just wanted to note, just really quickly, is that this is still one of those moments where I like to see the urban context, you know. I'm about, I just had dinner here yesterday and brunch here. It's very, very different than what it was before, and so as we think about the fact that it's across the street from the Convention Center Hotel, and the vibrancy of that, and the lighting of that, and those things there, and what's happening on the 7th Street side, what's happening at O Street Market, that sort of nature of how this neighborhood -- the context in which the Convention Center exists is very different than when it was built. And I was here in 2000.

And so this idea of really sort of understanding and respecting the evolution of the surroundings may have also warranted us thinking about this differently. So, I also just want to note, I want to thank Events DC for being here, for being also just a really great partner in all

of this. They've been a great supporter of the creative placemaking work that we've done as the Office of Planning, been inspired by that work, and been in direct consultation with the Design Division for a lot of this work. So I just want to just give kudos and say, once again, that you've been a really great partner to the Office of Planning and Design Division.

MR. LEIBNER: I appreciate it. And I should say our CEO, Greg O'Dell, would have loved to have been here to enjoy that praise. He's unfortunately on business travel, so, I'm in his stead, I just wanted to pass that along.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to add, Mr. Cash -- oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Shaw's comment reminded me that -- I mean, this is an area that absolutely needs to be, you know, lifted up, and that it needs to be -- it's never really recovered from the construction of the subway up 7th Street. That was the thing that I think really sucked the life out of the area, and I mean, that goes back a long, long way. It

predates the Convention Center, obviously. But this is, I think, needed. So.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas?

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Chairman. I love so much of this, so, thank you, and congrats. I have one thing I actually really don't like. And that's the Metro Plaza.

You know, the argument for doing something with the Metro -- and I've gone in and out of this Metro Plaza. I've experienced the space. It is very dark and scary. But so is this.

(Laughter.)

This is no better. And this is maybe even worse. I'm serious. I mean, please think through this. You asked for our concept comments. This has got to lighten up and be a brighter, more welcoming space. Please, please, please.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Hearing no other comments, is there a motion on the EDR?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved, and we didn't have an amendment. This has been moved and seconded.

So, deny an amendment?

MS. KOSTER: Excuse me. We have not actually approved the amendment, so it would be lovely -- Mr. Cash --

COMMISSIONER CASH: So --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Motion on --

COMMISSIONER CASH: I'll just say so moved on the amendment we've discussed earlier.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: So it's been moved and seconded? All in favor of the amendment, say aye?

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed, no?

(No response.)

Amendment is adopted.

Question before us is the EDR as amended.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Moved.

COMMISSIONER SHAW: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of the EDR as amended, say aye?

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed, no?

(No response.)

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great job.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY,
100 BUREAU DRIVE, GAITHERSBURG, MARYLAND
- DRAFT GAITHERSBURG CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The last item on our agenda is a significant one. The agenda item 5F is the draft master plan for the National Institute of Standards of Technology in Gaithersburg.

We had an information presentation on

this plan earlier in the year, and as noted, a number of us had the opportunity to visit the site yesterday. And again, I'll thank Mr. Neuberg and Ms. Cantilli for their hospitality yesterday.

So, Mr. Weil, welcome.

MR. WEIL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. The United States Department of Commerce has submitted a draft master plan for their National Institute of Standards and Technology in Gaithersburg, Maryland, also known as NIST.

You will remember that we were here back in February to provide you with an information presentation on the history of NIST and its campus. And NIST plans to submit its final master plan for Commission review later on this summer.

Here's a map that shows where NIST is located in Gaithersburg, which is in central Montgomery County, Maryland. The mission of NIST is shown before you here on the slide, which is

to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology, in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life. This serves as a measurement standards laboratory, and a non-regulatory agency within the United States Department of Commerce.

Here is a satellite photo of the 579-acre campus, and as seen here, four of the five campus edges are bordered by roadways, with Interstate 270 situated along its northeast side, and residential development and wooded parkland situated to the south. The campus consists of 62 buildings and structures, with over 3.6 million gross square feet of space per approximately 4,000 personnel.

About half of the permanent buildings are currently over 50 years old, and the campus exhibits many modern architectural design features from the late 1950s and '60s, which makes it eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as Historic District.

Here is an aerial view of the existing campus with north shown to the right, and from here on forward in my presentation, the remaining slides will be oriented in this manner. This campus is separated into three basic development-type areas, with support uses along the west side of the campus, specialty research in the south, and general purpose labs and administrative uses in the center of campus.

This graphic shows the campus's predominant natural features, with two ponds in the eastern portion of campus, a network of streams in the south, and tree clusters in many parts of the campus, with the two largest stands located in the northeast and southeast parts of campus.

The current campus development was constructed during each decade from the 1960s, with approximately 80 percent from the '60s and after the year 2000. As previously presented back in February, the entire NIST campus has been determined eligible for listing in the National

Register of Historic Places by the Maryland Historic Trust, based on its design as a mid-century modern research campus.

The master plan identifies a number of characteristics that define the historic campus setting, including a formal landscape, ample parking, large scale monumental buildings, and a mix of general and specialized laboratory. Historic building features include curtain wall construction, ample use of glass, clean, monolithic forms and minimal ornamentation.

In terms of campus access, there are a total of six gates, with gates D and E currently closed for regular use. Gates A, B, C, and F are available for employees, gates A and F are used by campus visitors with larger conference groups using gate F along Muddy Branch Road. And gate C and F are for delivery traffic.

NIST provides 2,672 spaces for its 4,007 employees, or 72 percent of its total parking capacity, which equates to an overall campus parking ratio of 1 to 1.5. Visitor

parking totals 769 spaces, or approximately 21 percent of total campus capacity, with the remaining seven percent allocated for short-term drop off and service vehicle parking.

The NIST master plan provides for the modernization of aging, inefficient buildings, and accommodates the anticipated growth and research programming over the next 20 years, with approximately 1.4 million gross square feet of new facilities, and 15 building renovations.

NIST's space and population growth assumptions are based on a number of lead-up studies, and a backward look at historic trends for its Gaithersburg campus, which show fairly steady, straight-line increases. And so the master plan maintains these growth rates into the future of the course of this 20-year time frame.

The plan summarizes a number of intended outcomes, including energy conservation, growth in a flexible manner, consolidated delivery operations and conference visitor processing, better campus security and a more

environmentally sustainable and active campus.

Here is a list of notable sustainability goals that the master plan is designed to achieve, that are based on a mix of federal, state, and local standards.

So here is the existing campus, and here are some of the more notable master plan projects that I will describe in a little more detail over the next few slides.

Starting with the heart of the plan, in an effort to focus future development within the historic core area, NIST developed six concepts, A through F, that would attain its planning goals with different configurations of new research and administrative space interwoven throughout the core. New research spaces shown with the blue-dotted circles, and new administrative spaces shown with rose-colored circles, with renovated space in green, and the pedestrian concourses shown as orangish-red dotted arrows.

Alternative A, known as capturing the

courtyards, shows new buildings located to create courtyards that can be developed into outdoor neighborhood spaces. The extending connections alternative would tie new buildings directly into the existing campus internal circulation spine, therefore extending the spine north and south.

Alternative C would create a new development cluster in the south, with a mixture of facilities and amenities.

Alternative D, known as capturing the center, would concentrate new development in the center of the core area, emphasizing proximity and assignment flexibility.

Alternative E would connect a new lab-only building to office space within the general purpose labs, and construct an office-only administrative building near building 301.

And finally, the NIST preferred alternative F shown here in red would use all new building space for research, with new administrative space spread throughout the general purpose lab buildings.

So, in comparison, alternative F is one of two concepts that extends new space along the existing interior pedestrian concourse spine, thereby, effectively repeating the historic core's development pattern. Alternative F is one of three concepts that maintains the integrity of the traditional historic core area boundary.

And while each of the alternatives redevelop surface parking to different degrees, concept D and F maximize redevelopment of the core area's surface parking, which is consistent with several NCPC parking consolidation polices from our comprehensive plan.

And one last thing to note, is that with concept F's concentrated new development in the core, development pressure in other parts of the campus is reduced, thereby helping to preserve NIST's more natural open setting.

NCPC staff finds that alternative F best preserves the campus core's existing grid pattern of development, formal landscape, monumental buildings, and mix of general and

specialized laboratories, which are identified as hallmarks of post-war research campus design.

With the master plan's consideration of a number of core concepts, and selection of its preferred alternative F, it is apparent that NIST has greatly weighed its campus history throughout its planning process, and the primary attributes of alternative F are effective at maintaining a balance between preserving history and meeting future needs.

Regarding the gate A visitor center development, NIST considered three different concepts to improve security, convenience, on-site circulation, and minimize adverse traffic impacts along West Diamond Avenue, ultimately selecting option 2, which is shown in red as their preferred option.

This concept provides adequate queuing space for waiting vehicles, a sheltered canopy area for vehicle inspections, and opportunities for faster visitor processing without overbuilding the facility as shown in option 3.

Moving on to gate F, which is located on the east side of campus along Muddy Branch Road, this considered four different concept options. Options 1 and 3 are minimal approaches that maintain the existing gate F entrance, but these would not meet NIST's needs, with inadequate queuing space, intermingled conference and delivery traffic and no sheltered areas for vehicle inspections.

Option two does a better job of separating conference and delivery traffic with more queuing space, but still does not provide sheltered inspection areas. And it's railway configuration would intermingle delivery traffic and conference traffic prior to the campus's security checkpoint.

Option four, which is the NIST preferred alternative, combines the positive attributes from each of the other three alternatives: adequate separation of delivery traffic and conference traffic, sheltered inspection areas, adequate queuing space and

separate facilities for each function.

So functionally, this alternative would provide a separate entrance for commercial truck traffic, leading to the inspection area and either allow the trucks to transfer their cargo to NIST vehicles which would then deliver the shipments on to campus or the outside truck traffic to deliver directly to on-campus locations. And visiting conference traffic would use a separate entrance, would enter campus, check in, and then continue past the security checkpoint to their final destination.

NCPC staff supports NIST's plan to consolidate its truck inspection, shipping and receiving, and conference visitor processing to gate F with ample space and less traffic along Muddy Branch Road. However, NIST should continue to refine the project to minimize impacts to the campus setting and neighborhood across the street through landscaping, potential access realignment, and light control measures.

Finally, NIST has plans to establish

a new east-west pedestrian promenade between Building 101 and the new corridor city's transit waste stop adjacent to campus. To emphasize this, path sidewalks will be widened to 20 feet with granite pavers to match those found around Building 101. And sections of the new roof will have an alternating pattern of planter boxes and pedestrian-height lighting, as well as pedestrian-only spaces and attractive landscaping.

This slide shows NIST's overarching landscape plan with areas for stormwater management, historic core sensitive standards, and reforestation areas. And here, I would like to point out that large portions of the campus outside of the developed areas will gradually evolve into new meadows and forest areas to help produce operating costs, help protect campus development from off-site noise and vibration and enhance the site's environmental sustainability.

The campus-wide stormwater management plan shows an intra-connected system of grand

gardens, bioswales, and planter boxes in addition to its existing infrastructure. The plan is designed to meet NIST's goal of treating 20 percent of all on site impervious area pursuant to Maryland State standards and to reduce nutrient and sediment loads per the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act.

Here is NIST's connectivity plan, which shows a network of recreational trails, future programmable spaces, and a complete network of sidewalks intended to improve on-site pedestrian and bicycle conditions.

And lastly, here is NIST's sustainability plan with future moves to generate solar power, reduce stormwater runoff, increase forest and meadow areas, and save on future building costs for more efficient development.

This next series of graphics shows future campus development in three phases, the first of which is identified as immediate development priorities including the gate A and F developments and much of the historic core area

development.

Phase two shows the full renovation of the main campus administration building, along with its library, cafeteria, and expansion to its conference space.

Phase three shows a series of new research labs in the western part of the campus core on the site of several employee surface lots, which NIST proposes to replace with a new 4 level, 720-space garage resulting in a total future employee ratio of 1 to 2, based on the campus's projected increase in federal employees.

And then here are the remaining projects and master plan which are classified as independent, since these may be constructed at any time as funding becomes available and their construction would not affect the sequencing of any of the other projects.

So here's the master plan's full build-out graphic with all 25 proposed development projects. Overall, the master plan proposes to expand parking to meet NCPC's

applicable 1 to 2 goal where it's identified federal employees which make up 70 percent of the campus's total employment population.

NIST excludes the remaining 30 percent, people such as contractors, guest researchers and associates who may not have access to all of its travel demand management programs. So the master plan results in an improved non-federal population ratio of 1 to 1.7 which contributes to the overall future campus ratio of 1 to 1.9 which is just short of NCPC's 1 to 2 goal for NIST.

Outside of the campus, I want to highlight two key planned pedestrian bicycle improvements. The first is a trail extension along the NIST side of Quince Orchard Road shown in magenta, which will align along the new corridor of city's transit way facility. And the second improvement shown in red will connect existing routes along Muddy Branch Road and West Diamond Avenue.

So blocking out to get a larger

perspective on the area, we see the NIST campus and some nearby local neighborhoods, in addition to the Red Line Shady Grove Metro Rail Station and Washington Grove Commuter Rail Station. And here is the first phase of the corridor city's transit way which is shown in green which will connect Shady Grove, Washington Grove, the NIST campus and other nearby existing and planned future walkable developments which are shown here with the beige boxes. With these improvements, NIST has a real opportunity to reassess its future parking needs once the CCT becomes operational and NIST employees may start to live closer to campus.

Lastly, here's a list of proposed travel demand management strategies from the master plan which NIST can use to help encourage future and non-single occupant vehicle travel by its visitors and employees. Given this list, in addition to nearby planned transportation improvements and future housing, NCPC staff believes that NIST should prioritize development

of the detailed travel demand management plan with specific information on future mode shared goals, program implementation, and regular commuter travel monitoring for both federal and non-federal workers. And prior to any net increase in on-campus parking in the future, NIST should submit a transportation progress report to NCPC for review with information related to NIST travel demand management programs and travel trend information.

So here are our recommended comments for Commission adoption today in these next two slides and I'll just go through these quickly by highlighting a few key points.

First, we are recommending that the Commission support the alternative F concept which is the NIST preferred concept, so concentrate new development in the historic campus core, preserve the open space nature of the campus, and facilitate professional collaboration. We are also recommending that the Commission find alternative F to be the most

successful, providing for NIST's research mission while preserving its historic core and innovating new sustainability measures.

Regarding historic preservation, we're commending NIST's careful consideration of the campus's unique historic character throughout the planning and design process. For sustainability, we're recommending support for NIST's effort to meet federal and state sustainability goals and we are recommending that the Commission find that all the proposed alternatives, including alternative F, will convert significant amounts of manicured property to new forests and meadow areas, identify a campus-wide stormwater management system, and identify future solar panel installations and net zero energy buildings.

And lastly, regarding campus accessibility and transportation, I want to highlight that we're making three requests of NIST. We're requesting that NIST continue to refine the design of new gate F to minimize

impacts to the campus setting and off-site neighborhoods. We're requesting that NIST prioritize development of a detailed travel demand management plan with future mode share goals, program implementation information, and regular commuter travel monitoring for both federal and non-federal employees. And lastly, in light of NIST's future plans to increase parking on campus, we're requesting that NIST submit a transportation related progress report to NCPC for review prior to submitting the proposed new parking projects with information related to NIST travel demand management programs and travel trend information.

So thank you. That concludes my presentation. I'm available to answer any questions and we also have representation here from NIST as well. Thank you.

[INSERT - NIST]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Weil. Mr. Cash.

COMMISSIONER CASH: So I know we're kind of running up against time here so I'll kind of make this like an Oscar speech and just run through my top three issues here.

(Laughter.)

So, firstly, I was on the trip yesterday. It's a beautiful campus. It's kind of amazing. It's 600 acres for eventually 6,000 employees which gives each 1/10th of an acre all to themselves on the entire campus. But maybe this sounds really cheesy, but it made me think of a variation on a Joni Mitchell song that we "reforested paradise and put up a chain-link fence around the entire thing" so that what's actually detailed on the bottom of this map is like it's really cool, there's going to be reforested land. There's now natural-looking lakes there. There's absolutely no buildings or anything, security requirements, yet it's set aside as an accommodation for people that are on

the campus. So I think there's a lot of lost opportunities for the public to get in here including a lot of museum space and other cool stuff that's not currently accessible to the public. And I can imagine the City of Gaithersburg would probably love to some of this land back. It just seems like a fairly underutilized site. So that was kind of points one.

And then two was the public access. There's a really cool museum space in here. You have to go through security. There's a bunch of other neat things like there's a big tiled wall where you can see a sample of every single building material that's on the far south side of the campus, again, not open to the public, so that's kind of a shame.

And then I'm going to kind of take a cue from others that I've heard that the parking ratios here, I don't kind of buy it. So one of the things that seemed unique to this campus is that there's a lot of visiting researchers here

at any given time. I think a NIST representative yesterday said that there's some people that stay there for 20, 30, 40 days for longer engagements. I'm guessing those are not picked up as a federal employees in here, so we're meeting it for these straight-up employees, but for all these visiting researchers, contractors that might be on site which is actually a very high proportion here, we're not even getting there. And if you look at where their parking is now and this is on slide 37 in our packets, right now on an average day, there's only 2,600 vehicles on the site with 3,700 spaces, so they've already got a surplus of a 1,000 parking spaces and they're adding more. On conference days, there's only a surplus of 700 spaces, so I can't imagine that we're actually going to be increasing parking spaces on this already massive campus and not try to -- hoping that they can actually bring it down and use some more creative ways to avoid people coming and parking on campus.

I'll note, too, that in the actual

master plan, there's a photo of people in the conference area which is to the right side of this photo. A lot of people had to park on the grass which makes it seem like there's not a ton of space, but I'm guessing that's because the conference attendees don't want to park a couple of parking lots down, therefore they park on the grass instead of one of the thousand open parking spaces. I would just throw that out there as concerns I have. We're not going to address the parking ratios here. This is still, I know, preliminary, but it's something that I hope NIST thinks about given -- maybe I would defer to Mr. Wright. They seem kind of a very blessed agency when it comes to the amount of space that they have to do a lot of creative things there. I would hope they do everything they can to get rid of a lot more impervious space and encourage people not to drive so much when they're only a couple of miles away from a Metro.

There was a lot there, but I just kind of wanted to run through the concerns --

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Speed read.

COMMISSIONER CASH: -- so that the chairman can make his train back.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: What he said, plus yeah, I was struck by the -- it's a beautiful campus, not too much the buildings. I mean, you know, I was led to a better appreciation of the mid-century modern, but oy.

Inside it's just really a bummer, a lot of it. So I would just like to encourage at this stage that you get a really good architect to be mindful because nobody leaves the campus. They're there all day. I know that they're scientists and they like their laboratories, but they're also human beings who need some light and warmth and variety and all that stuff.

And I just have to make one comment that I was really dismayed to hear the word eradication more than once about the wildlife there. I know I have no credibility because I'm a wacky vegan, but I just think accommodating the wildlife instead of eradicating the wildlife

would be something to consider, because you're going to lose the battle and if you don't lose the battle what a shame because they were there first. And a wildlife management program usually means kill them and I don't know that you want to do that because it's really charming. But I did hear eradication more than once.

(Off mic comment)

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's okay. Now I'm serious, getting -- having cars that are plan B of thoughtful and purposeful landscape plan that is directed towards plant stuff they don't like. They won't eat it. And we did see a huge herd and it was -- if I worked there, I would love that, not to mention the groundhogs. Okay, I'm finished.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Thank you. Sorry, I wasn't there so I would have loved to have seen it.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: It's beautiful.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: But I do love

this master plan. I think it's a very clever incision, like a surgeon, and I kind of want this surgeon to do my next surgery.

(Laughter.)

So thank you very much. No, I really do like the plan. There's a little graphic thing that you might want to look at, but it seems to be -- you know, the buildings that are all lined up on page 18 versus 20 sometimes we're growing north and sometimes we're growing south instead of -- there's a conflict, but I don't know if that's 18 or 20 in your book, but in this one, if you could look at that Mr. Weil and --

MR. WEIL: Are you talking about --

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: Page 18 and page 20. Page 18, the two little fingers that grow up on alternative F, and then on page 20 one finger grows up and one finger grows down and so I don't know which one we're actually approving here, but I'd just get graphics right.

The reason I looked at it is because I'm concerned about light and air in those two

buildings where we're kind of overlapping and so I just want you to please consider that as part of your overall design.

And then my last comment -- well, actually, I have two. Is the new pedestrian promenade the one that will go east to west, the purple one? Is that covered or what's the character of that, do we know? How wide is it? This is on page 30. That's fine. That looks good.

MR. WEIL: So my understanding and maybe NIST can help me out, is this is just going to be a real robust very attractive streetscape with very wide sidewalks, a lot of pedestrian amenities, and a lot of landscaping along the street just to kind of draw people between the Building 101 and the future CCT stop. And they talked about having alternative planters and using the same type of paving that's surrounding Building 101 which is significant. I think there's also going to be a pedestrian-free space along several portions of the promenade as well,

along with kind of lower pedestrian-scaled lighting. So that's all I really read in the master plan. I don't know if they have any more details at this point.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: I just think I'm going to be very interested in seeing your overall -- as a plan, it's a brilliant move, a very clever connection for pedestrians to encourage the CCT usage.

And then my last question is minor, is the entrance at gate F signalized today?

MR. WEIL: It is.

COMMISSIONER GALLAS: It is, okay. Thank you. That's it.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Any more questions, comments? Hearing none, again, Mr. Neuberg and Ms. Cantilli and others, thank you for being here today. Again, thank you for your hospitality. Yesterday, it was -- seeing is believing in all respects of your campus and your buildings.

Is there a motion on the EDR that's before us which is for comments on the master

plan draft?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I move.

COMMISSIONER WHITE: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of the EDR as before you say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

Opposed no.

(No response.)

It is passed. And that ends our very long day. We had a number of items that weren't insignificant and great deliberation and thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:10 p.m.)

A

a.m 11:14
AASHTO 203:13,17 204:22
ability 18:19 93:5
able 6:12 28:14 33:3,5 69:18 84:11 199:16 214:8
above-entitled 259:14
abroad 137:2
absolutely 150:20 153:15 154:14 227:17 250:20
abstract 155:5
accept 105:8 216:8
acceptable 183:8
accepting 11:16 110:9
access 31:5 32:15 33:10,18 42:22 47:11 70:5 71:4 78:8 94:15 97:19 98:10 118:12 128:3,10 133:12 140:10 144:6 151:17 174:8 179:17 234:12 241:20 245:7 251:10
accessed 30:18
accessibility 20:14 128:20 248:19
accessible 123:8 145:5 251:4
accidentally 106:16
accommodate 41:20 44:6,19 45:6,17 48:4 70:18 114:21 115:1 121:13 124:7,17 126:1,16 131:2,11 133:3 176:17 180:18 183:21 184:11
accommodated 118:14 126:8
accommodates 235:7
accommodating 133:14 254:21
accommodation 250:22
accomplish 200:14
accomplished 136:21 137:13
account 25:17 212:14
accreditation 57:6
accustomed 83:2 159:1 159:1
achieve 40:2 51:11 132:5 236:4
achieving 59:19
acknowledge 150:7 151:11 177:19 205:21
acknowledges 172:15 178:1
Acosta 2:11 11:3,5 12:5
acre 6:18 116:18 180:10 232:9 250:11
acres 19:22 74:10 116:17 173:1 250:10
act 49:16 113:14,18 137:21 141:6 243:7
action 3:16 17:21 79:11 80:1,3,15 106:8,21 167:9 177:13
activated 225:9
active 57:2 124:11,17 127:2,9,16 133:6,10 178:22 179:6 184:6 236:1
activities 32:8
activity 10:19 30:1 212:19
acts 143:3
actual 8:18 34:12 181:8 215:6 252:22
adapting 92:10
add 32:20 46:15 105:12 143:12 211:13 227:14
added 32:2 79:8
adding 45:12,14 252:14
addition 22:9 23:11 24:12 25:12 31:7 32:19 37:3 40:6 41:15 46:1,9 61:4 79:15 106:10 118:6 119:5 119:11 127:16 128:1 129:8 221:11 222:16 243:1 246:2,20
additional 18:22 22:22 29:6 30:4,5 32:20,22 36:5 37:3 38:2 41:3,5 42:15 47:18 48:2 50:16 59:2 116:11 132:20 156:8 158:12 161:10 169:17 177:15 182:5 185:16 186:2 204:2,3 221:9 222:14
address 18:16 31:10 38:4 49:10 51:16 53:14 67:16 68:13 76:20 81:5 82:22 88:1 99:6,14 111:11 122:5 132:20 175:17 190:4 193:15 195:9 210:20 253:10
addressed 54:5 62:9 79:21 99:2 101:6 119:10 140:22 195:3
addresses 216:6
addressing 20:12 214:22
adequate 70:16 100:12 239:18 240:20,22
adhered 62:1 64:11,16
adjacent 28:2,19 126:22 127:7,15 128:19,22 129:6,16 176:8 221:21 223:14 242:3
Adjournment 4:21
administration 1:22 61:13 244:3
administrative 233:8 236:15,18 237:17,21
admission 66:21
adopted 229:20
adoption 247:12
advances 131:13
advancing 232:2
advantage 32:7 151:16
adverse 239:14
advice 53:15
advisory 54:2 57:9
advocate 205:4
advocated 38:17
aerial 233:1
aesthetic 89:15 102:12 167:18
aesthetics 39:14
affect 48:17 244:17
affirm 71:12
afford 57:16 169:12
African 29:14 30:17 33:21 57:16,22 61:15 147:21
afternoon 5:3 53:4,6 69:5 74:2 163:10 164:1 231:7
agencies 49:13 52:16 86:14 89:12 118:8 122:2 144:22
agency 10:3 11:22 24:5 50:12 232:6 253:14
agenda 5:8 6:7,9,16 10:19 11:2 12:5,12 13:1 15:1 17:11,12,19 18:2 108:9 112:8 163:6 217:21 230:18 230:18
ages 70:13
aging 235:6
ago 70:10 136:7 169:2 207:1
agree 58:2 101:10 103:13,18 104:7,11 104:16 150:11,11 153:1 158:15 206:7
agreed 190:10
agreement 23:17 49:14 53:21 171:8 183:7,10 183:13 200:10 209:11 215:3,5,7,10
agrees 138:7
ahead 135:6 138:3,3 204:1 219:12
AIB 42:14 101:5
aid 219:15
aims 51:19
air 3:19 108:8,12,14 164:18 256:22
airplanes 161:1
Alderman 61:5
align 125:12 245:17
alignment 94:14,16
Allegiance 5:7 6:1
Alliance 57:8
allocated 235:3
allow 28:19 29:4 34:6 34:16 37:16 43:13 46:16 47:1 57:17 58:13 68:10 114:14 130:1 132:17 137:17 241:5
allowances 113:13
allowed 110:4 225:15
allowing 33:20 63:16
allows 63:21 103:22 140:15 169:2
alluded 135:12
also-ran 149:15
alter 48:9 79:16 106:11
alterations 4:11 27:21 43:8 47:14 217:20 218:1
alternating 242:7
alternative 23:22 24:14 24:14,20 25:4,8,15,17 26:4 52:5,7 55:9 75:6 76:11,14 122:9 132:5 236:22 237:4,7,10,14 237:19 238:1,5,19 239:5,8 240:18 241:2 247:16,22 248:12 256:17 257:18
alternatives 23:1,6 24:5 46:18 50:14 238:8 240:20 248:11
amazing 250:10
amber 93:8
ambitions 55:3
amend 105:12
amended 107:22 229:22 230:5
amendment 79:8 105:7 106:2 107:3,4 206:2 214:14 215:14,17 216:11,13,17 217:5,6

219:6 222:1 223:21 224:22 229:3,5,7,12 229:15,20
amenities 20:16 28:1 29:6 32:15 237:9 257:15
America 57:12
America's 97:16
American 57:7 115:12 115:13 116:2 136:11 147:22 203:14
Americans' 137:9
amount 71:11 179:3 205:14 253:15
amounts 248:12
ample 234:6,10 241:16
Anacostia 164:14 165:15,16 166:12 169:14 170:14 171:17 172:5 173:8,10 178:6 185:18 186:10 190:8
analysis 36:5 40:20 60:11 150:9 167:4 174:2
analyze 24:15
analyzes 172:5
analyzing 131:10
ANC 221:20
Andrews 3:11 13:3 164:18,19
angle 101:22
ANNE 2:16
anniversary 153:11 162:9
announcements 11:6
annually 141:17
answer 81:7 88:17 186:15 191:7 249:16
answered 136:5
anticipate 90:11 109:3 109:4 204:1 205:11 205:14
anticipated 51:2 141:9 204:19 216:7 235:7
anticipation 8:8 81:18
anybody 205:13,13 218:9
anymore 58:1
anyway 16:22 83:8 106:6 143:5 200:19 211:11
apparent 239:5
apparently 98:5 158:4
appear 168:8
appears 175:13
applicable 245:1
applicant 50:9 112:21 113:3 114:18 117:3 120:2 122:4,10 125:2 129:4 131:4 132:4,9 132:19 179:8 183:2
applicants 197:9
applies 113:14
apply 66:10
appointed 43:19
Appointee 1:14,15,16 1:21
appointment 3:3 8:12 8:20 10:7
appreciable 67:9
appreciate 6:14 76:9,17 76:18,22 77:5 78:13 92:16 100:14 110:22 138:10 158:14 159:12 159:16,18 189:19 200:20 227:9
appreciated 7:2 85:11
appreciation 254:8
appreciative 91:8 181:21
approach 25:5,9,19 26:1 60:8 68:3 122:11 132:22
approaches 151:19 240:4
appropriate 21:11 27:5 41:10 99:7 121:16 124:18 133:7 138:21 143:13 144:14 145:2 167:10 172:1 174:9 180:12 183:18 184:8 200:6
appropriated 79:13
appropriately 101:6
appropriateness 185:12
approval 12:14 14:3 18:3 19:9 110:12 111:18 112:9 114:9 115:8 182:3,14 192:19 193:16 194:8 194:22 195:16,18 197:19 208:17 209:5
approvals 114:8 197:7
approve 80:17 107:14 161:14 170:6 182:20 197:18 199:16 200:1
approved 79:9,20 80:18 89:13 114:11 144:22 229:7
approving 196:17 203:7 256:19
approximately 19:22 61:18 62:12 232:15 233:19 235:1,9
April 1:7 5:5 8:2 11:12 11:13
apropos 203:1
arch 168:19 194:12
arched 167:8 168:7,11
arches 168:18 169:22 170:1 186:7 193:19 195:4,5,22 196:2 198:20 208:1
arches' 183:5
architect 72:2 94:11 143:5 144:18 254:11
architects 60:4,18 77:7 201:8
architectural 42:19 155:9 171:21 232:19
architecturally 91:12
area 19:15 36:1 60:22 98:8 113:11 118:21 119:21 120:18 121:5 122:22 124:9 128:17 129:2 133:17 141:5 145:16 152:4 165:22 171:18 172:14 173:18 175:13 177:17,20 178:1,7,13,16 179:2 181:8 185:14 212:22 213:22 216:6 221:2 223:9,11 224:13 227:17,21 236:12 237:12 238:7 239:20 241:4 243:4,22 246:1 253:2
area's 238:11
areas 31:16 50:17 69:19 115:22 125:20 173:22 175:6 176:9 181:11 221:12,16 224:2 233:6 240:8,13 240:22 242:12,14,16 242:17 243:16 248:14
arena 224:5 225:13
arguably 140:3
argue 155:3
argued 83:7
argument 228:9
Arlington 127:20
Armed 115:12
Army 145:15
arrange 120:9
arrangement 120:13
ARRINGTON 1:15
arriving 138:11
arrows 236:21
art 29:14 30:17 39:11 41:12 48:6,11 57:16 57:22 61:15 63:19 69:8 176:13,19 180:6 180:11,19 184:8
Arthur 61:14
articulated 189:16
artificial 171:19
artificially 102:9
arts 20:4 21:6 24:10 36:10,13 42:13 44:11 45:1,18 46:14 53:18 58:18 75:1 79:17 80:12,21 81:10,17 83:17 85:4 86:6,16 87:4,22 88:10,11 89:3 89:7,15 92:5 94:2 106:12 115:5 131:1 139:21 159:21 160:2 178:5 201:7
aside 80:5 149:3 200:16 250:22
asked 86:17 87:20 97:5 186:5 193:17 228:17
asking 84:3,10 218:9
aspects 26:8
asphalt 16:15 61:22 64:10,15
asphaltic 64:2
aspirations 104:16
Assembling 136:12
assembly 61:21 68:2 68:10
assessed 52:2
assessment 210:21
assets 54:19 57:5
assignment 237:13
assist 43:18 88:14
assistance 28:15
associate 26:17 68:20 85:16 149:8
associated 45:8 128:16 130:19 182:7 195:14 224:7
associates 29:14 68:22 69:1,6 70:6 71:13 245:6
association 112:18 113:8 116:7,15 134:1 135:8 147:2 203:14
Association's 158:20
assumed 177:21
assumptions 235:12
assure 159:22
Atlantic 161:3
attain 236:13
attempt 67:15
attendance 6:4 59:14 75:3
attendees 253:6
attention 72:3 98:10 103:8
attitude 162:4

attractive 103:15 242:9 257:13
attributes 239:8 240:19
audible 9:16 17:9
audience 70:6
auditoriums 69:18
augments 69:12
authority 83:20
authorize 113:6
authorized 11:10
automatically 10:9
available 19:7 43:6 52:19,20 69:22 88:13 134:1 138:22 186:15 234:15 244:16 249:16
avenue 19:17 20:7 33:3 34:18 35:6,14 37:19 51:7 74:14 93:22 95:19 96:5 110:13 117:2,5,16 121:4 129:10,21 130:5 132:13 143:17 145:4 153:6 161:2 179:21 181:16 184:16,17 239:15 245:21
average 252:11
avoid 122:15 132:10 252:20
avoiding 50:1
award 139:22
awareness 126:5
awful 193:6
awfully 149:13
axes 179:18 184:14
axial 120:9 143:20,22 164:10 178:12 180:21
axil 143:16
axis 165:5 179:19,21 180:7,20 184:16,17
axonometric 125:9
aye 9:13,14 17:6,7 107:5,6,22 108:1 111:21,22 161:19,20 215:18,19 216:18,19 217:6,7 229:16,17 230:6,7 259:6,7

B

B 24:14 76:14 234:14 255:11
back 21:15 31:19 56:3,8 76:4 78:6 81:14 82:9 82:21 84:18,21,22 85:12 87:4,5,14 88:4 88:16 89:8 90:12 103:19 105:5 107:17 110:21 112:22 138:2 141:22 143:2 147:18 150:21 153:20 154:13 157:9,20 190:5 193:1 197:11,22 209:4,9,14 209:15,20 210:14 223:17 227:22 231:14 233:21 251:7 254:3
backdrop 127:22 180:15
background 26:7 36:14 115:9 117:16 135:12 180:15
backward 78:1 235:13
bad 90:2
badly 155:19
Baker 135:13,15 138:16 155:16
balance 33:11 55:11 239:9
balances 178:8
balancing 33:18 51:2 51:22
balustrade 143:18
Banneker 151:7
barrier 100:5 206:11
base 3:11 13:3 101:5 164:18,19,21 173:10
baseball 162:16 185:19
based 119:7 138:12,21 139:13 140:5 234:2 235:12 236:4 244:11
basement 26:2 29:3,18
basic 233:5
basically 83:16 194:8 210:3
basis 25:20 26:6 52:6 58:19 83:10 85:19 138:10
basketball 225:13
battle 159:4 255:2,3
Bay 243:7
Beach 14:3,6
beautification 144:17
beautiful 38:21 110:18 147:22 217:12 220:1 250:9 254:6 255:21
beauty 135:17
befitting 168:4
began 21:15 168:1 189:20
beginning 70:22 138:15
begins 68:9
behalf 69:6 72:6 74:3,5 85:8
behoove 148:9
beige 246:10
beings 254:15
believable 160:17
believe 8:4 25:16 75:6 80:6 81:14 85:8 140:21 141:13 144:13 156:14 171:20 177:22 200:21 203:3
believes 34:14 127:13 130:3 168:3 182:1 246:22
believing 258:19
beloved 39:6,18 54:12 92:1
Belvedere 119:4 126:21 128:19 129:21 130:2 130:7 133:9 139:22 140:2 148:19 149:3
Belvedere's 143:15
belvederes 168:13 169:10,12
beneficial 32:11 90:5 117:19
benefit 16:17 27:13 33:10 40:2 124:8
benefits 55:21
best 12:3 24:20 25:19 83:20 136:8 141:14 155:4 238:20
BETH 1:21
better 30:22 34:19 75:11 76:12 92:14 124:17 126:18 130:11 137:11 152:20 156:17 176:17 177:8 185:15 192:3 193:3 197:20 203:3 213:6 217:16 223:17 228:15 235:22 240:10 254:7
beyond 23:1 104:3
bicycle 203:16,19,22 204:5,19 208:4 216:6 243:12 245:14
bicycles 210:1 212:6
BID 74:5,8,10,17
big 17:12 60:21 76:3 78:20 91:16 96:4 97:8 101:13 149:21 157:13 251:13
bigger 104:1
bike 168:12 169:7,16 202:13
bikers 202:16,21
bikes 174:5 202:4 205:4
billion 141:16
bioswales 243:1
Bird 144:16
birds-eye 120:15
bit 95:12 103:3 131:8 157:3,3 168:14 188:16 190:13 197:20 222:4
blah 221:13,13,13
blessed 253:14
blind 213:21
blindside 67:3
block 103:4 122:16 123:1 125:4 130:4 131:17 220:21 223:13
blocker 104:4,7
blocking 149:20 245:22
blocks 103:2 123:2,3 126:4 188:18 224:18
blue-dotted 236:17
blueprint 136:10
board 55:8 62:2 147:19
boat 109:12
Bolling 173:11
bond 116:2
book 27:22 29:8 61:2 98:1 256:12
boosting 75:2
border 74:19
bordered 232:10
borders 173:8
born 208:18
bottom 96:4,5 164:20 166:13 168:20 179:14 250:17
boulevard 166:2
bound 155:7 169:6
boundary 238:7
bowl 183:6
boxes 242:7 243:1 246:10
bragging 9:20
Branch 234:17 240:2 241:17 245:20
breach 64:5
break 63:10 112:13
breaking 86:10
bridge 4:8 14:6 127:5 158:7 163:5,8 164:6 165:2 166:5,18 167:7 167:14 168:2,4,7,10 168:11,16,21,22 169:1,4,13 170:4,7,14 170:16,19 171:2,3,7,9 171:14 172:6,16,17 173:4 174:22 182:1,4 182:14,20,21 183:4 183:12 185:10,12,14 185:16 186:4,18 188:4,6,15,19 190:16 191:16 194:22 197:19 198:7,16,19 201:14 201:21 202:1,5,19 204:1,20 205:8,12 206:19 207:1,16,21 209:21 210:2 211:19

212:4 213:22 214:2 220:15
bridges 131:4 156:17 163:11 170:4 171:16 171:21 172:5 183:1 183:14 185:18 188:19
brief 56:9 134:2 164:15
briefly 138:6
bright 199:7
brighter 228:19
brightly 199:4
brightness 224:6
brilliant 258:7
bring 56:2 76:4 107:17 188:7 198:2 252:19
bringing 90:11
brings 105:5
broad 115:21
broader 16:17 28:10 129:2 185:17 186:1
broken 27:20 62:19
Brooklyn 201:21,22 202:19 206:19,22 209:21 210:2
brought 12:17 13:4 112:21
brunch 226:6
Budget 189:9
budgetary 110:15
buffer 129:6
buffering 121:17
build 92:15 148:2 159:8
build-out 244:20
building 3:19 13:2 15:2 20:4 21:7 24:10 26:16 29:16 30:10 31:3,4,10 32:5 36:11,14 37:9 40:4 42:14,17,21 43:2 43:6,7,9,13,20,22 44:3,12,14,18 45:2,5 45:13,16,19,22 46:3,8 46:14 47:4,12 53:19 56:13,17 58:18,21 59:4,6 60:6,20 61:7 61:14 63:4 64:9,21 65:11,14 68:4 70:21 71:9 79:17 80:21 93:1 94:3 102:19,21 106:13 108:10,11 110:13 111:19 159:6 163:11 165:10,20 180:2 210:7 220:17 224:13 234:9 235:10 237:15,17,17,20 242:2,6 243:17 244:3 251:15 257:17,20
buildings 20:13 21:5 38:22 51:20 54:12 55:22 58:10 62:19 77:12 221:2 232:14 232:17 234:7 235:6 237:1,4,22 238:22 248:17 250:20 254:6 256:8 257:1 258:20
built 56:18 61:20 67:22 151:1 169:3 207:1 210:9 226:16
bummer 254:9
bunch 160:18 192:5 225:8 251:12
bundle 208:22
burdensome 85:22
Bureau 61:8 230:15
buried 154:2
buses 33:2
Bush 136:22 137:4
business 72:7 74:4 227:12
busted 211:9
busy 127:1
buy 251:20
bypass 109:7

C

C 2:11 234:14,18 237:7
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 3:1
café 27:22 29:8
cafeteria 244:4
cajoling 190:13
Calendar 3:7 12:11,13 12:14 15:5 16:2 17:3 17:5
call 6:6 10:22 136:5 190:12
called 224:5
camps 69:10
campus's 233:10 240:15 244:12 245:3 248:6
campus-wide 242:21 248:14
canopy 42:6 239:19
Cantilli 6:14 231:4 258:17
capable 32:6
capacity 70:18 114:20 131:10 234:21 235:2
capital 1:1,12 3:12 5:4 9:12 12:1 14:5 55:4 65:4 135:17 143:7 199:8 221:17 224:5
Capitol 4:6 61:10 74:12 163:4,7 164:4,11,11 165:5,7,11,14,19,20 166:4,19 170:12,18 171:4,5 172:8 173:4,5 176:10,21 178:10,13 179:20 180:2,14 181:4 182:7,16 183:6 183:18 184:10,15,16 220:18 221:5 224:16
caption 181:19
captured 21:21 105:16
capturing 236:22 237:10
care 106:7 221:4
careful 157:1 248:5
carefully 201:6
cares 54:8
cargo 241:5
CARLTON 2:13
carries 17:10
cars 174:5 207:9,11 213:2 255:10
cartway 181:8,12,15,19
case 10:5 25:22 49:19 56:14 62:21 89:20 94:5,9 109:20 114:22 117:2 206:10
Cash 1:14 156:19,20 190:18,19 191:19 192:16 219:4,5,8 220:3,5 222:20 223:2 223:6 225:1 227:15 229:8,9,11 250:2,3 254:2
castle 20:3 21:4 22:4,10 22:16,20 25:9 26:1,2 26:13,15,20 27:2,7,12 27:15,17 28:2,20 29:12 30:1,9,16 31:22 33:5,12,17 34:17 35:13 36:11,22 39:4 43:4,7 44:20 49:3 51:18 56:13,20 58:10 58:17 79:16 91:19 94:16 105:1 106:12
cause 63:9,12 67:19 141:2
causing 68:16
CCT 246:12 257:17 258:9
ceiling 65:19
ceilings 65:8,16,17
celebrating 184:22 209:18
Cemetery 127:20
center 4:11 26:21 27:3 27:6 28:18 30:12 44:19 45:3,9,12 58:16 60:9 61:16 68:22 69:16 94:7 117:10 118:5 119:22 123:14 124:2 127:3 145:10 196:3 217:19 218:2 218:11 223:14 225:5 225:7 226:9,15 228:1 233:9 237:11,12 239:11
centerpiece 19:21
central 45:21 58:12 69:7 125:15 168:19 224:13 231:20
centralized 27:5 30:14 120:5
centrally 69:16
centric 220:12
century 56:21 118:7 122:1 123:20 128:3 144:4 145:8 150:21 152:17 157:5,7 234:3
CEO 135:7 227:10
certain 99:8
certainly 86:1 90:11 97:12 110:16 154:6 159:16,19 161:13 200:15 201:6 205:8
cetera 78:9 81:17
CFA 72:10 81:12 82:21 86:3 101:11 163:14 167:12,19 171:10 183:9 185:7,10,16 186:3,8 190:4 193:1 193:11,16 194:4 195:2,9 196:11,12,19
CFA's 90:10 148:22 197:17
chain 150:8
chain-link 250:15
chair 8:5,19,22 9:2,7,12 9:19 10:8,9 74:1 81:12 84:8 85:4 89:9 109:6 156:10
Chair's 10:6
challenge 128:7 181:11
challenged 31:5 43:7
challenges 6:22 118:20 124:13 128:16 129:16 130:19 132:1,10
challenging 133:13
change 21:11 39:13 162:4 197:2
changed 26:4 43:8 51:15 137:10,11 178:14 184:3 196:6,7
changes 8:2 9:3 22:9 24:11,15,21 25:5,12 25:13 26:9 31:10 32:10 39:13,16 40:7 46:5,19 47:19 50:19 91:4 193:11 196:18 196:22 197:10

changing 22:11 35:2 39:12 42:11 51:5,6 54:17 178:2 196:4
channel 194:13
character 25:11,22 39:5 40:15 44:14,21 248:6 257:8
characteristics 26:20 40:20 41:2,5 234:5
charming 255:6
check 150:10,10,11 241:11
checkpoint 240:16 241:12
cheesy 250:13
cherish 54:14
cherished 42:9
Chesapeake 243:6
Chicago 210:8
Chief 143:6
Chinatown 225:12
choices 155:9
Chorus 9:14 17:7 161:20 215:19 216:19 217:7 229:17 230:7 259:7
circle 143:19,21 166:11
circles 147:11 236:17 236:19
circular 120:8 127:6
circulation 29:1 31:16 33:18 54:7 144:3 174:8 237:5 239:14
circumstance 224:20
city 20:5 51:6 70:3 147:5 160:22 164:13 165:1 167:11 185:19 251:5
city's 242:2 245:18 246:5
Civil 144:12 147:22
claim 97:18
clarification 105:15
clarify 106:1
clarity 186:12 197:17
classes 69:9 75:9
classified 244:14
classrooms 69:15
clause 222:13
clean 234:10
cleaned 188:6
clear 21:3 43:15 79:1 84:18 89:1 106:15 107:13 128:21 136:19
clearly 26:15 153:22 224:14
clever 256:1 258:8
climate 39:14
close 75:20 90:13 105:3 115:19 133:10 135:19 139:15 145:6 157:7 158:8 169:3 224:9
closed 9:11 234:14
closely 91:1 190:3
closer 94:2 152:13,20 246:14
closure 118:3
Club 57:12
cluster 237:8
clusters 233:13
coalition 115:10 116:3 120:22 136:12 155:17 156:6 159:6
coalitions 156:17
cohesion 152:16
Cole 57:20
collaborate 69:17
collaboration 108:5 112:17 190:14 192:10 247:21
colleague 57:20 68:20
colleagues 54:13 69:17 155:22
collect 38:10
collections 38:9 61:2 69:13
collegial 83:22
color 171:1 198:16 199:14 206:8 222:16
colored 204:12 206:9
colorful 153:1
colors 193:22 221:11
Columbia 1:15,20 4:2,4 74:22 113:10 162:22 163:2
combination 19:19 140:6
combines 240:18
come 72:5 81:22 84:18 84:22 87:5 88:16 109:11 153:13,20 160:7 162:21 188:22 191:22 197:22 199:19 199:21 202:6 209:4 209:14 210:13 219:1
comes 64:5 140:2 156:4 191:1 224:21 253:15
comfortable 199:2
coming 16:18 84:20 98:7 153:18 155:17 157:9 159:14,15 197:10,11 209:9,14 211:9 224:11,11 252:20
comity 87:13
commemorate 147:15
commemoration 116:5 122:10 162:9
commemorative 113:9 113:13 121:1,8 123:13 125:16 131:22 132:5 141:3,9 162:14
commenced 114:10
commend 93:13
commending 248:5
comment 16:2,12 18:13 24:3,19 38:17 65:5 75:18 84:19 85:1 99:9 99:15 103:12 110:8 111:1 112:20 141:20 143:4 145:21 146:11 155:15 156:21,21 160:15 170:8 195:21 204:6 210:5 216:10 220:13 224:1,2 227:16 254:17 255:8 257:4
commentary 152:21
comments 11:16 18:3,5 19:1 24:1,5,9 36:2 38:16 50:14 53:2,14 54:5 55:8 77:16 80:11 80:16 81:5,13 85:16 86:5,8 87:2 88:13 90:21 93:15 100:15 107:14,15,19 109:15 109:22 111:3,13 112:9 115:3,4 131:5,5 132:20 134:2 143:8 143:12 148:4 154:11 156:9 158:12,18 159:12 163:18,20 167:17 170:10 182:5 182:14 183:3 184:20 186:4,13 190:6 193:2 193:15 195:3 201:10 214:14 219:2,14,17 220:18 222:5 228:18 228:22 247:11 258:16 258:22
Commerce 4:15 230:13 231:9 232:7
commercial 123:6 225:14 241:3
Commission's 5:5 50:11 79:11 131:5 143:9
Commissioners 74:2 111:22 138:1 140:1 140:16 209:8
committed 40:9,14 56:22 209:14
committee 1:17 3:4 8:13,21 10:8,10,13,14 10:17,18 72:1 167:18 167:22
common 84:1 136:15
communicated 86:20
communications 72:9
communities 162:15 188:7
community 2:13 16:17 32:7 75:12 223:18
commuter 246:4 247:4 249:6
comparison 238:1
compatibility 223:8,11
compatible 37:15 99:13 133:5 178:17 184:4
compelling 139:9 150:14 152:19 154:6
competitive 168:1
competitiveness 232:2
complementary 126:12
complete 43:5 53:22 243:10
completed 28:3 41:19 61:12 181:3
completely 63:20 77:14 139:17 148:22 154:22
completion 39:19 159:4 191:17
complex 58:21 61:13 61:17 62:11
complex's 62:13
complexes 42:21
complicated 70:20
comply 49:15
component 39:7 166:3 172:9
components 121:7 167:3 172:19
composition 103:9
comprehensive 11:9 20:22 21:17 42:7 99:1 140:17 238:13
comprising 61:14
compulsion 154:20
conceived 40:18
concentrate 237:11 247:18
concentrated 238:15
concentric 119:17
concept 18:6 22:2 23:1 24:13 25:16 26:5 47:17 50:18 51:13 55:14 66:10 77:20 80:17,19 83:8 91:7 96:18 97:2 106:20 123:16 129:5 131:21 164:4,8 167:15

172:21 175:16 176:3 179:5 182:15 184:6 186:4 193:16 194:8 195:16,17 214:16 217:22 223:10 228:17 238:10,15 239:18 240:3 247:16,17
concepts 78:5,8,15 79:1 113:2 126:7 131:15 160:7 236:13 238:2,6 239:4,13
conceptual 19:11 186:12
concern 80:8 84:16 86:9 89:4,4 98:20 141:2 170:16 171:2 198:14 199:10 201:14 205:22 206:22 208:3 208:12 213:20 214:10 220:22
concerned 105:4 197:6 203:8 205:5 212:17 221:8 256:22
concerning 79:6 89:21
concerns 25:6 51:16 76:20 80:20 85:7 86:20 88:1 91:2 93:15 93:17 97:6 100:11,20 104:13,18 109:13 148:10 170:12 171:13 185:13 190:4 192:17 219:3,6 223:21,22 224:12 253:10,22
conclude 46:4 131:7 186:14
concludes 133:22 249:15
conclusion 159:21 181:20
concourse 238:3
concourses 236:20
concrete 61:22 62:5 63:7,9 64:8,11,18 65:19 67:17,19,19 168:7 204:12
concrete's 63:9
concur 38:19
condition 24:7 25:1 36:15,15 37:6 39:18 43:14
conditions 172:15 209:6 243:12
conducted 140:16
conference 69:18 234:17 235:21 240:7 240:11,15,21 241:9 241:15 244:5 252:15 253:2,6
conferences 69:10
confidence 192:20
confident 197:2,3
configuration 25:1 37:9 39:22 240:14
configurations 236:14
confirm 23:22
conflict 159:7 188:17 202:4 210:16 256:11
conflicts 202:20 205:19 208:5 216:7
confront 137:2
confronted 95:10
confusing 31:5
congrats 217:14 228:6
congratulate 192:11
Congress 61:7 113:5 137:1 141:5 162:7
Congressman 135:11
conjunction 34:5 50:10 52:14 167:21
connect 26:10 29:2,19 30:10,15 31:22 35:18 75:11 103:10 169:18 174:16 182:18 237:14 245:19 246:7
connected 45:20 100:16 130:10 164:21
connecting 127:10
connection 29:13 34:20 46:13,17 47:1,5,10 58:6,17 89:5 117:22 118:6 130:17 132:15 145:8 150:21 151:12 151:13 164:17 174:13 175:12 179:22 180:22 181:6,7 183:22 184:19 258:8
connections 119:2 121:21 124:3 126:10 139:10 151:21 160:22 174:9 178:6 186:9 237:3
connectivity 20:14 46:2 46:10 53:16 118:11 172:17 243:8
connects 27:10 31:1 150:15 164:13 166:5
consent 3:7 10:7 12:11 12:12,13 15:5 16:2 17:3,5
conservation 235:19
consider 23:3 41:4,8 57:5 99:10 109:7 119:13 122:11 132:4 152:1 176:16 180:17 183:20 214:11 255:1 257:2
considerate 152:9
consideration 117:20 154:11 157:16 167:16 239:3 248:5
considerations 91:5 122:6
considered 46:18 65:15 66:3 67:13 131:12 239:12 240:3
considering 25:3 109:2 132:21 200:16 204:16
consisted 167:18
consistent 9:2 20:20 44:13 45:6,15 119:19 133:19 238:11
consists 10:21 232:13
consolidate 241:14
consolidated 31:16 32:3 235:20
consolidation 238:12
consortium 190:8
constituents 55:6
Constitution 117:2,5,7 117:16 121:4 129:9 129:12,20 130:5 132:13 137:18 138:9 139:3 140:15,20 143:17 145:3 150:12 158:6
constraints 110:16 157:17 194:14
construct 237:16
constructed 145:1 164:16 165:9 233:18 244:15
construction 41:18 49:8 165:1 168:6 194:14 227:19 234:10 244:17
constructive 78:3
consultation 52:14 227:4
consulting 23:13 49:13 50:4 59:22 75:22 195:13 209:11
consumption 58:14
contemplate 54:22
contemplation 140:14 155:6
contemplative 115:1 121:14 124:12,16 126:17 129:7 130:9 130:16,20 132:17 133:4 144:7 148:5
contemporary 27:20 43:12 48:10 147:16
content 59:1
context 20:5 35:2 51:6 92:10 125:21 126:6 130:11 131:17 143:19 143:21 147:4 148:1 158:10 165:8 168:4 184:9 185:14 186:1 226:4,14
contexts 185:17
contingent 110:11,12
continue 39:13 41:20 42:9 63:13 66:13 71:4 81:21 101:12 102:10 107:16 122:4 132:19 176:3 180:14 186:6 208:6 212:11 241:11 241:17 248:21
continued 75:13 108:5 116:8 119:10
continues 48:6 104:15 177:22
continuously 39:12
contractors 245:5 252:7
contradictory 130:6
contrary 83:1
contrasting 195:6
contributes 245:10
control 166:16 241:21
controversial 224:10
controversy 109:5
convened 1:9
convenience 239:13
Convention 4:10 217:19 218:11 223:14 225:5,7 226:9,15 228:1
conversation 59:11 189:19
convert 248:12
converted 164:22
conveyed 223:15
convince 160:8 213:16
cool 250:18 251:3,11
cooperation 159:8
coordinated 177:10
coordination 47:7 119:10 171:22 211:16
copy 88:9
core 20:19 27:11 57:5 123:11 170:15 172:2 172:7 236:12,16 237:12 238:7,11,16 239:4 242:13 243:22 244:8 247:19 248:2
core's 238:5,20
corner 102:1 117:6 120:4
Corps 145:15
correct 88:17,18

correction 107:1
correctly 82:3
corridor 4:7 91:19 118:18 122:19 123:15 129:22 130:5 143:17 143:22 163:4,7 164:5 166:2,5,15,19,19 171:4 172:9 182:4,8 182:15,15 242:2 245:18 246:5
costs 58:14 70:4 242:18 243:17
Council 1:14 54:2
Counsel 2:16
counterpoint 39:8
countries 115:11 136:15
country 155:17
County 231:21
couple 6:10,12 79:6 90:21 93:16 99:5 100:7 135:5 143:13 208:7 219:6 253:6,20
courage 137:14
course 16:3 54:4 87:3 107:19 116:5 137:4 159:20 197:21 207:8 235:17
courses 69:8
Court 166:7
courtyards 237:1,2
cover 67:4
covered 257:7
covers 74:10
crack 64:8
create 25:4 30:22 31:11 38:21 83:11 98:10 100:17 102:6,14 113:8 124:12 129:6 129:18 131:22 190:11 199:6 237:1,7
created 167:17
creates 100:4 125:6
creating 130:20 172:14
creative 227:2 252:20 253:16
credibility 254:20
Creek 3:13 126:22 127:8,11,17
criteria 113:19 116:8,12 140:5 145:12
critical 133:18
critically 21:4
cross 42:22 169:13 213:13 214:10
crossing 128:6 164:14 204:11
crossings 118:16 181:17
crosswalk 128:21 213:16
crying 193:5
crystal 136:19
cue 251:19
cultural 19:20 27:8 75:1 114:3 122:7
Culture 143:6
cumulative 170:13 171:14 172:6 183:11
curious 80:14 81:3
current 24:7,22 37:5,9 38:18 51:2 59:17 103:14,20 119:8 168:2 188:10,11 198:19 233:17
currently 10:13 27:20 30:17 32:9 44:4 63:15 67:9 100:1 125:1 128:17 232:18 234:14 251:4
curtain 234:9
cut 31:18 101:20 129:19
cutting 59:8
CWA 113:14,15 116:10
cyclists 206:12 210:17

D

D 24:14 25:15 234:13 237:10 238:10
D.C 1:10 27:10 57:19 60:5 113:17 144:22 147:21 158:1,3 163:3 164:21 165:18 166:15 167:19 171:11 173:7 173:16 181:3 183:1 183:16 185:17 220:16 220:17 224:13 225:16
D.C.- 220:11
dance 189:13
dark 102:8 225:7 228:12
Darwina 141:21
dash 129:11
date 139:6
dated 93:1
day 102:22 112:4,11 127:18 141:10 202:14 252:11 254:13 259:11
daylight 43:1
daylighting 31:7 32:1 32:16,21
days 16:21 214:18 252:3,15
daytime 199:2
DC 3:14 4:6,10 16:19 54:3 74:10,11 119:5 178:4 183:10 217:18 221:9 222:14 226:21
DDOT 166:14,16 167:6 167:13,16,21 171:6 171:10,15,20 172:3 173:6 174:2,12,17 175:3,7,14,19 176:3 177:7,14 178:20 179:11,16 181:4,21 182:9,13 183:6,9,12 183:22 184:18,21 185:6,9,21 186:16 189:4,8 190:3,15 191:3 215:9
DDOT's 189:22
de 154:19 213:12
deal 101:1 151:5
deals 60:19
decade 178:15 233:18
decades 55:3,15 137:7
December 59:11 112:22 135:11
decide 148:2
decided 158:5
decision 114:13 169:1
decision-making 21:9 83:19
decisional 101:8
decisions 21:10 138:11 179:10 223:18
deck 64:12 65:14 66:14 67:2,17,21 68:5
declare 112:11
dedicated 70:8 168:12
dedication 135:16
deeper 103:19
defect 64:7,12,13
Defense 1:18 3:10 161:11 162:8 173:12
defer 253:13
deficiencies 18:17
define 96:10 125:19 234:5
defined 120:6 125:10
definitely 138:9 222:10 225:17
degrees 238:9
delegate 209:1
deliberate 115:12
deliberately 83:11
deliberation 17:15 259:12
delicate 55:12
delineate 181:6,18
delineation 204:10
deliver 56:17 241:6,8
delivery 234:18 235:21 240:8,11,14,20
Delmar 191:11
demand 245:7 246:16 247:1,9 249:4,13
demonstrated 160:9
deny 229:5
Department 1:16,18 3:10,11,21 4:2,15 13:4 118:10 123:3 124:1 144:11 161:11 162:22 164:3 173:11 175:20 191:13 215:1 216:4 230:13 231:9 232:7
depending 161:3
depict 174:19
describe 26:11 28:7 48:15 175:4 236:8
described 126:9
Desert 3:21,22 4:12,19 112:7,7,10,10,17,19 112:19 113:7 115:9 115:10 116:1,1 118:2 134:4,4 135:7,18,18 136:1 137:8 138:4,4 141:12,12 149:5 150:19 160:17
deserves 137:20
designate 141:5
designed 42:4 68:11 143:16 168:8 236:4 243:3
Designer 2:12
designing 203:4
designs 19:12 52:1 56:3 114:17,19 125:3 131:21 132:19 133:19 180:17 184:10 186:11
desirable 124:18
desk 72:10 163:18
destination 51:8 241:12
destinations 75:2
detail 30:6 81:14 85:6 95:3 99:10 116:11 168:14 173:20 236:9
detailed 122:14 169:6 216:5 219:2 247:1 249:3 250:17
details 21:12 47:19 56:7 94:12 189:10 258:4
deteriorate 63:10,12,13 67:20
deteriorating 168:10
determine 115:6 183:7 203:9
determined 34:13 40:11 194:6,16

233:22
determining 131:6 138:20
develop 22:22 122:4,9 132:19 171:8 172:3 183:7,10,13 190:11 199:12
developable 173:17
developed 19:13 21:18 23:7,17 24:14 30:3 74:17 94:12 99:4 117:1,3 120:2 125:3 167:22 236:12 237:2 242:16
developing 21:9 49:14 52:11
development 12:15 14:2 20:11 83:9 101:7 113:1 173:10,14 178:5 200:22 206:20 207:3 232:12 233:17 236:11 237:8,11 238:5,15,16,21 239:12 242:19 243:17 243:19,21 244:1,21 246:22 247:18 249:3
development- 233:5
developments 243:22 246:9
diagonal 181:17
diagram 49:7 98:2 99:3
diagrammatic 186:11
diagrams 45:4 78:18 174:3 179:9
dialogue 198:11
Diamond 239:15 245:21
died 153:15
diene 62:3
different 22:6 26:11 59:8 78:2 99:6 100:7 102:11,22 111:9 120:13 121:7,14 150:9 156:1 159:20 172:15 174:4 176:6 180:19 181:9,9 206:9 220:11 226:7,15 236:14 238:9 239:12 240:3
differently 226:20
difficult 70:5 128:11 130:20 133:12 159:2
difficulty 144:6
dignitaries 172:12
diligence 140:17
diligently 159:14
Dillon 61:16 68:22
dimension 202:12
dining 75:9
dinner 226:5
dip 22:3,19 51:17
diplomacy 116:4 124:2
diplomatic 118:8 122:1 136:9
direct 29:13 46:13 47:1 58:16 72:3 151:17 174:12 176:10 183:22 227:4
directed 255:12
direction 35:16 107:16 189:21
directly 26:17 29:19 31:21 237:4 241:8
director 2:11 3:5 11:3,4 43:19 57:21 60:4 68:21 190:20
Director's 132:12 182:12
disagree 148:22
disappointed 70:17
disconnected 31:5
discuss 23:13 37:20 75:5 119:3,3 172:19
discussed 46:11 67:18 148:20 229:12
discussing 167:3
discussion 17:4,16,17 21:19 46:5 76:5 107:3 107:21 108:7 109:8 156:13 158:17 161:10 171:12 217:1
discussions 59:12 78:3 119:8
disembark 33:3
dismayed 254:18
dismissed 109:19
disperse 33:6
display 48:11 224:6
disrespect 97:17
disrespectful 85:10
distance 67:9 168:20
distinct 114:11 129:18 166:17
distinction 125:19
distinctly 176:6
distinguish 176:13 183:1
distinguishes 170:3
distinguishing 132:6
distribution 205:10
district 1:15,20 4:2,4 8:15 9:6 10:12 16:17 20:2 72:7 74:4,22 92:17 113:10 139:18 140:4 141:16 162:22 163:2 164:2 170:4 175:20 178:15 183:17 191:12,21 192:2 215:1 216:4 221:1 232:22
disturbing 79:2
dives 154:3
divided 166:20
Division 227:5,8
divisive 162:5
Dixon 1:15 8:22 9:6 10:11 16:1,7 88:19,20 89:2 90:7 107:8 156:10,12 160:14 188:3 217:2 229:1,13 230:2
docents 28:12
document 11:18
documents 7:4 177:18 177:19
DOEE 185:4 189:8
doing 8:11 82:16 86:1 136:16 150:10 191:15 194:20 195:10,13 222:3 228:9
dome 61:10
domestic 136:17
donor 111:7
door 225:15
dotted 150:14 181:12 236:21
DOUGLAS 186:18
Douglass 4:7 163:5,8 164:6 165:2 166:18 170:7 174:22 175:5 184:22 188:9 207:21 209:18
Douglass' 175:1
download 11:18
downloaded 80:3
downtown 221:2
dozen 202:19
draft 4:17 18:3,12,21 21:13 23:8 25:20 26:6 26:9 40:19 50:9,14,15 51:19 52:10 230:16 230:19 231:10 259:1
drainage 62:6
drains 38:11
dramatic 22:3 44:22 46:18 51:17 176:11 183:19
dramatically 58:14
draw 257:16
drawing 147:19 169:7
drawings 36:5,8 99:11
drawn 150:14
Dressing 67:12
drive 14:3,6 19:18 20:8 22:16 47:6 56:10 230:15 253:19
driver 192:5
driving 70:4
drop 235:4
dry 67:11
DS 92:12
dual 176:20
due 26:18 29:6 37:9 107:19 127:15 128:13 129:16 132:14 137:7 140:17 178:9,12
duke 159:9
Durell 144:18
dynamic 92:18,19

E

E 4:10 122:18 144:9 217:19 218:2,11 234:13 237:14
EA 83:15
earlier 80:13 153:2 163:21 173:2 177:7 177:17 186:3 225:12 229:12 231:1
early 40:18 62:9 83:6 114:19 160:10,12
earth 62:6
easement 190:10
easily 123:8 140:10 141:8 188:7
east 74:13 117:10 121:4 123:1,2 125:13 165:16 172:10,20,22 172:22 173:2,12,19 174:3,9 175:2 176:10 176:16,21 177:3 179:8 180:13 181:2 181:13 183:15 188:18 189:18,19 240:2 257:6
east-west 242:1
east/west 144:21
eastern 125:4 233:12
easy 128:4 158:22
eat 255:13
Ecodistrict 35:19
economic 232:4
edge 59:8 211:20
edges 94:9 232:10
EDR 79:8,21 80:10 84:12 95:15 105:7,12 107:8,9,10,21 111:14 111:21 150:8 159:19 161:15,19 203:8 205:21 217:1 220:13 228:22 229:21 230:5 258:21 259:5

EDR's 217:5,6
education 28:9 69:7
educational 32:8
Edward 144:18
effect 81:6
effective 62:17 239:8
effectively 18:19 100:4 145:19 238:4
effects 49:17 50:1 79:18 106:13 172:6
efficient 58:12 243:17
effort 7:2 21:15 43:18 115:11 236:11 248:8
efforts 7:1 76:9,17,19 78:22 158:20 159:16 159:18
eight 169:15 201:19 202:8,9 203:10,20 204:3 205:16 206:16
EIS 23:9,16 52:8 83:15 84:20
Eisenhower 148:4
either 166:11 171:15 175:2 199:14 212:19 241:5
elaborate 71:10
elected 83:14
election 3:3 8:11,20
electronically 105:18
elegant 168:3 170:3 182:22
element 11:9 120:6 129:8 131:15 133:19 180:10 183:19 184:11 221:7
elements 39:12 41:9,12 45:14 56:11,15 81:20 96:15 120:9,14 121:2 122:12,16 124:22 125:12 126:2 129:15 131:2,8 132:5 133:20 149:19 157:15 166:21 170:2 175:4 176:12 176:18 177:10 180:18 182:7
elevated 210:9
elevation 37:7
elevator 71:3
elevators 29:2
eleventh 82:17
eligible 232:21 233:22
eliminate 207:13,14
elimination 137:5
Elizabeth's 170:21
eloquently 103:3
emails 24:4
embarked 178:20
embracing 55:13 75:7 151:9
emphasize 172:17 242:3
emphasizing 237:12
employee 244:8,11
employees 6:18 234:15 234:20 244:12 245:2 246:13,19 249:7 250:11 252:5,6
employment 245:3
empty 225:8
enable 58:22 59:8
enclose 120:17
enclosed 45:8
encompass 62:12
encounter 172:13
encourage 157:14 188:14 246:17 253:18 254:10 258:9
encouraging 167:12 212:18 213:9
endeavored 55:1
endorsed 186:3
ends 88:10 146:11 259:10
enduring 136:7 137:11
enemy 137:2
energy 58:13 175:20 235:19 248:16
Enforcement 3:8,9 12:17,18,20
engage 54:16 81:20,21 87:13 156:2
engaged 23:12 55:6 87:22
engagement 38:12 50:4 74:21
engagements 252:3
engineering 30:4 70:20
Engineers 145:15
Engraving 61:8
enhance 30:21 32:17 46:2 232:3 242:20
enhanced 26:21
enhancing 20:15,16,18 27:13
Enid 57:1
enjoy 227:11
enliven 58:15
ensure 10:2 56:17 176:4 177:10
ensuring 59:20
enter 33:4,5 241:10
entering 28:5
entire 22:15 67:2,4 83:22 85:20 140:18 141:5 233:21 250:12 250:16
entirely 17:18
entrance 29:10 57:18 98:7 110:12 173:4 240:5 241:3,10 258:11
entrances 58:9 81:2 93:22 94:1 100:2
entries 104:17
entry 32:22 53:17 57:14 62:18 64:18,19,21 66:14 78:8
envelope 60:6 65:11 68:4
envelopes 60:20
environment 31:12 175:21
environmental 23:8 54:6 242:20
environmentally 236:1
envisioned 166:2,6
envisioning 97:2
envisions 56:8
EPDM 62:4 63:22
equally 22:14 205:9
equates 234:21
equipment 191:5
era 118:3
eradicating 254:22
eradication 254:19 255:7
ERIC 1:19
especially 170:11 213:8 225:3
esplanade 166:22 175:6,9,10 179:15 213:18
esplanades 184:22
espoused 152:19
essentially 88:16 192:18
establish 74:21 118:20 130:4 241:22
established 74:9 136:19
establishing 57:9
esthetics 139:13
et 78:8 81:17
etcetera 208:2
ethylene 62:3
Evacuating 71:6
evaluate 23:9 33:15 41:16 113:2 114:15 114:19 122:15
evaluating 29:22 128:17
evaluation 116:9 221:12,15 222:17 223:3,7
EVAN 1:14
event 10:4 44:9 59:16 136:4
events 3:14 4:10 16:19 32:8 44:2,6,15 45:6 75:9 87:4 115:18 136:7 217:18 221:9 222:14 226:21
eventually 250:10
everyone's 154:20
evidence 110:7
evident 124:4 126:11
evolution 226:18
evolve 48:6 242:17
evolves 178:7
evolving 35:14 51:7 92:10 180:8 182:17
exact 40:10 111:4 195:6
exactly 106:8 153:18 159:5 195:4 200:14
example 38:9 44:14 59:10 114:21 122:7 131:14 136:8,14 213:12
examples 40:21 154:8
excavation 26:2
exceedingly 69:9
excellent 12:10 16:7 17:2 53:12 144:19 149:10 162:1
exception 87:18 173:14 209:6
excerpt 123:11
excited 16:14 75:10 94:5 147:6 188:4
exciting 10:21
excludes 245:4
excuse 168:17 169:22 229:6
execution 53:10
Executive 2:11 3:4,5 8:13,21 10:8,9,12,13 10:17,18 11:3,4 132:11 182:11
exemplary 38:20
exercise 147:14
exhaustive 139:1 147:14
exhibit 32:2
exhibition 43:14 44:9
exhibitions 44:17 75:9
exhibits 28:6 44:15 232:19
exist 44:10 67:5 94:3
existed 151:9
existing 20:6 22:13 27:22 31:4,9,17 34:3 34:9 35:5 36:9,14

37:1,8 39:6,22 40:20 41:9 48:15 51:21 68:5 106:16 118:14 128:13 168:10,22 169:3 233:1 236:6 237:5 238:3,20 240:5 243:2 245:20 246:8
exists 37:14 65:1 226:15
expand 30:21 58:15 244:22
expanded 29:9 32:15 69:20 75:8
expanse 165:14
expansion 244:4
expansive 34:16 65:13 93:6
expectation 23:18
expecting 136:1 151:10 201:3 211:2
expedite 218:6
experience 18:18 26:10 27:14 28:4,22 31:1 32:17 38:22 40:3 65:12 77:11 116:13 125:8 127:15 158:21 161:5 167:13
experienced 71:7 228:11
experiencing 70:13
expert 65:11 202:10
expire 8:6
explain 47:19 86:11
explanation 9:2 87:18
explore 174:12 175:4 183:22 184:18,21
expose 63:10
exposed 42:22 44:22
express 16:14 59:21 74:5 131:1
expressed 24:6 38:14 76:21
expressing 84:15
expression 43:15 155:9
extend 119:1
extended 117:18
extending 164:11 166:6 237:3,6
extends 238:2
extension 120:12 129:11,20 245:15
extensive 185:22
extent 97:15 151:11 225:16
exterior 3:19 4:11 61:8 63:3 108:11 111:20 217:19,22
extra 222:13
extraordinary 92:1
extreme 84:15

F

F 25:4,17 75:6 76:11 234:15,15,17,18 236:13 237:19 238:1 238:5,10,19 239:5,8 240:1,5 241:16 243:21 247:16,22 248:12,22 256:17 258:11
F's 238:15
FAA 194:11
facade 111:9
facilitate 247:20
facilities 6:21 19:20 26:11 27:8 28:18 29:14 31:1 33:1 55:1 123:7 235:10 237:9 241:1
facility 3:11 13:3,5 30:11 32:12 58:20 170:22 239:22 245:18
fact 16:20 38:15 57:6 78:13 156:16 160:20 162:7 200:16 226:8
factoid 158:2
factually 138:12,12
failed 63:16,21 66:22 68:2
failure 71:1,7
fairly 197:1,3 198:15 199:1 235:14 251:7
faith 115:17
fall 90:17 110:18
falling 225:18
falls 20:1
familiar 26:14 77:7 148:7
families 70:17 162:12
fan 149:21
fancy 78:21
far 77:2 79:20 105:1 145:3 160:9 162:17 183:19 196:7 201:1 205:5 251:15
farmers 179:1,13
fashion 33:9 83:22 84:1 180:5
fast 202:18 213:2
fast-growing 57:18
faster 189:17 239:21
fate 102:22
fault 61:2 135:5
favor 9:11 17:5 84:11 107:4,21 111:20 161:18,19 215:17 216:17 217:6 229:15 230:5 259:5
fear 225:6
feasible 41:13
feature 131:20
features 125:17 132:7 232:20 233:11 234:9
February 191:14 231:14 233:21
federal 8:15 10:3,3 12:1 85:17 86:13 87:13 89:12 113:9,15 123:6 170:22 173:7 177:21 194:13 221:3,7 236:5 244:12 245:2 247:4 248:9 249:7 252:4
feedback 25:18 85:9
feel 58:4 87:8 102:18,20 140:14 143:4 152:15 154:19 188:16 189:21 197:20 199:17 200:1 201:5 221:14
feeling 44:21 111:5
feels 85:21 95:12 117:21 124:3 154:4
feet 54:9 61:18 62:7 104:22 168:17,17,19 168:21 169:16,17 170:1 196:7 201:19 202:8,9,13 203:10,18 203:20 204:2,3,4,18 205:16 206:16 210:3 210:8,9,10 211:3,4,20 212:1,9 232:15 235:9 242:4
fence 94:21 95:1,12 250:16
fences 97:8
Festival 44:4
FIELD 7:4
fields 3:15 15:3 16:13 16:16 117:13
fighting 156:15
figure 147:14
fill 64:1
final 13:2 14:2 23:16,19 24:1 52:7 53:20 54:6 84:21 87:6 108:10 111:19 115:7 164:5 170:6 182:3,13,21 191:22 192:19,21 193:17 194:22 197:19 208:17 209:5,15 223:18 231:17 241:12
finalize 93:3
finalized 36:17
finalizing 53:7
finally 11:20 32:1 42:1 46:4 47:13 77:5 121:3 124:20 126:20 131:7 133:15 177:1 184:20 185:3,6 188:9 237:18 241:22
find 11:17 27:2 28:17 35:11,21 39:3 44:8 45:12 66:17 80:4 82:15 98:17 124:15 126:15 128:10 130:14 131:20 133:13 149:15 159:5 247:22 248:10
finding 79:9 84:13 105:12
finds 79:14 106:9 133:2 133:11 169:21 176:7 180:9 181:15 183:16 184:7,16 207:22,22 238:19
fine 45:1 80:12 81:10 83:17 85:4 86:6,16 87:4,22 88:10,11 89:3 89:7,15 92:5 115:5 131:1 138:7 139:21 159:21 160:2 201:7 218:10 224:22 257:9
finger 256:17,18
fingers 256:16
finish 59:3 84:9
finished 178:4 201:4 255:16
firm 60:6,19
first 6:11 11:7,11 18:7 23:1 26:12 28:4 31:15 49:4 54:21 66:17 70:9 76:8 77:17 90:22 93:21 109:2 114:9 115:22 117:5 118:21 125:6 139:6 150:7 155:1 158:19 166:10 170:10,16 172:19 173:2 190:19 192:19 193:13 198:18 207:22 214:21 243:20 245:15 246:5 247:15 255:4
firstly 250:8
fit 185:13
fits 148:1
fitting 137:18
five 10:21 202:13,14 232:9
fix 193:6
flagship 51:9
flared 65:17
flat 25:8 65:13 155:21
flaws 71:9
flexibility 237:13
flexible 58:22 126:15

133:2 235:20
flip 109:20
Flis 2:12 18:7,8,9 53:12 94:10,18 96:7,21 98:3 98:22 101:17,20 102:4 105:14,20 106:1,6,18 112:11,11 112:12
flooding 71:2
floor 96:9 150:4
flow 64:22 66:14 67:8 180:22
focal 27:9 165:11 180:13
focus 90:16 94:8 138:20 150:12 177:18 236:11
focused 24:9 54:18 59:12 70:14 95:18
focuses 115:21
focusing 148:17
Folger 57:4 61:3
Folk 44:3
folks 205:3
follow 55:15 137:22 143:3
followed 136:17 138:15
following 81:9 83:16 118:2 139:1,19 167:15
follows 179:20
foot 95:11 114:13 168:6
footprint 45:5 61:17 62:13
force 155:8 164:18
forces 115:12 196:9
foreboding 95:4
foreground 143:19,20 199:7
foreign 136:9
forest 242:17 243:16
forests 248:13
forever 137:10
forget 137:12
forgot 154:17
forgotten 136:4
form 19:20 38:18 67:13 100:9
formal 174:20 179:17 234:6 238:21
formally 85:3 87:21
former 57:20 122:22
forms 26:6 37:21 121:9 234:11
Forrestal 102:19
forth 20:21 42:7 49:22 50:3 74:6 85:12
forward 16:20 75:12 88:11 95:16 100:15 108:5 135:9 161:6 182:8 189:2 194:17 194:21 195:1,12,17 201:3 212:2 225:20 233:3
fought 153:15
found 28:6 150:10 242:5
foundation 62:20
four 12:13 119:16 168:13 169:9 188:18 232:9 240:3,17
frame 173:3 235:17
framework 52:11 123:11 189:9
frankly 57:1 90:1
Frederick 4:7 163:4,8 164:6 165:2 166:18 170:7 174:22 175:1,5 184:22 186:18 188:9 207:21 209:17
free 136:13
free-for-all 210:3
Freer 20:3 21:6 36:10 36:20 94:2
friendly 32:5
friendship 159:8
front 20:3 21:22 22:3,20 25:21 51:18 163:19 222:9
frontage 35:7 94:14
full 43:16 86:12 149:9 153:16 160:6 196:13 209:4 244:2,19
fully 64:11,16 87:14 90:3 172:1 201:4
function 25:7 48:10 103:7 144:2 241:1
functional 32:12
functionality 24:17 26:10 30:22 31:13 39:14 46:3 48:16 51:3 51:20
functionally 241:2
functions 31:20
Fund 3:9 12:19
funder 111:6
funding 19:6 43:6,21 145:2 244:16
funds 59:6
furniture 174:20
further 17:4 25:2 27:7 33:6 37:12 39:5 40:13 41:19 44:11 47:19 49:6 52:1,15 65:7 85:17 99:4 107:15,21 113:2 119:1 123:21 125:13 132:3,8,18 133:6,18 139:8,15 150:1 152:15 161:18 166:20 193:10,18 196:1 197:3 217:1
future 24:9 37:2 40:22 41:2,11 42:16 43:22 47:6 48:13 53:10 55:13 59:13 111:6 117:9 118:22 119:7 119:16 123:15 136:10 137:13 141:3,9 145:9 145:16 147:9,15 157:3 166:7 174:10 176:16 180:17 182:9 183:20 184:10 206:19 207:7,8 235:17 236:11 239:10 243:10 243:14,16,19 244:11 245:10 246:9,12,18 246:21 247:2,6 248:15 249:4,8 257:17

G

Gaithersburg 4:17 6:13 230:15,16,21 231:12 231:20 235:14 251:6
Gallas 1:16 9:1,7,11,21 16:8 93:11,12 94:17 94:20 96:17,22 98:4 99:16 100:13 101:15 103:10 104:11 109:14 110:1,2 111:16 150:1 150:2,5 154:14 161:16 192:14 201:12 201:13 204:21 206:3 207:10,15 208:7,10 208:15 210:22 211:8 212:12,16 214:5,7 216:8,14 217:12,14 228:3,4 255:17,18,22 256:15 258:5,13
Gallas' 109:21
gallery 20:4,5 21:6 29:15 30:16 33:22 36:10,20 47:16 61:15 63:19
gap 66:4
garage 244:10
garden 22:19 25:11 29:10 30:12 34:12 35:8,18 37:21 38:15 38:18 39:3,6,10,21 40:7 41:9,11 42:4 46:6 47:5,12,15,21 48:3,9,14 49:6 51:17 57:1,4,4,11,12 60:10 61:19 67:21 80:22 91:6 95:13,19 96:6 97:6,16 98:8,13 101:9
garden's 48:17
gardens 22:7,10 24:7 24:22 25:22 34:8 35:12,22 38:19 39:15 39:17 40:21 41:6,14 41:19 42:8 46:1 50:20 54:12 56:1 57:3,7,11 91:5 243:1
gate 94:18 100:3,3,8 234:17,18 239:11 240:1,5 241:16 243:21 248:22 258:11
gates 100:2 234:13,13 234:14,15
gateway 34:19 110:12 118:17 165:6,15 167:11 173:5 176:12 176:20 180:10,18 182:16 183:16,19 184:11
gateways 165:20 172:12
gathering 122:22 124:16 125:15,20 126:17 130:16 132:17 179:6
general 1:22 2:16 32:10 51:10 61:12 70:7 120:19 171:19 177:13 233:8 234:8 237:15 237:22 238:22
generally 20:20 90:5 116:18 120:6 127:11 131:9
generate 243:14
generations 136:11 137:13
generic 78:13
geographic 139:9
geometry 200:17
George 136:22
getting 128:5 192:3 194:21 222:5 252:9 255:10
gift 190:13
give 72:5 107:15 153:19 168:19 190:10 197:19 200:19 209:5 213:12 223:16 227:6
given 26:22 71:11 121:20 122:7 124:6 167:10 176:7 177:6 179:2 180:7,9 206:20 221:4,21 222:9 246:19 252:1 253:13

gives 250:11
giving 56:7 210:1
glad 16:3 60:14 91:9 101:4 143:2 192:15
glass 104:9,22 234:10
glean 148:9
goal 56:19 59:19 84:1 243:3 245:1,12
goals 20:20 21:1,17,18 23:4 24:17 45:15 51:4 51:12,22 141:15 167:22 236:3,14 247:3 248:9 249:5
goat 151:5,8
golf 16:3
gotten 110:6 193:4
Government 1:17 166:16 173:16 221:4
grade 20:15 26:2 28:1 28:19 30:8,19 32:1 33:1 47:4,15 61:1,4,6 63:7 65:14 96:10
gradually 242:16
grand 22:18 100:3 242:22
grander 167:13
grandeur 27:15
granite 242:5
granted 83:3,18 157:5
granting 192:19
graphic 233:10 244:20 256:6
graphics 19:11 243:18 256:20
grass 122:20 253:4,8
grassy 173:22
gravel 62:6
greater 57:16 203:1 225:6
greatest 42:20
greatly 24:16 25:14 239:6
green 35:20 236:19 246:6
greener 58:11
Greg 227:10
grey 49:9
grid 238:20
gross 232:15 235:9
ground 33:19 57:15
ground-level 225:8
groundbreaking 191:4 191:14
groundhogs 255:15
grounds 16:15
group 57:9,13
groups 33:2,4,9 234:17
grout 66:7
Grove 246:3,4,7,7
grow 256:16
growing 35:3 51:6 58:3 75:11 189:17 256:9 256:10
grown 70:9
grows 256:18,18
growth 93:6 235:7,11 235:16,20
guess 72:8 148:17 152:15 156:13 185:7 189:1 192:22 193:13 199:10 208:17 213:3 221:6
guessing 252:4 253:5
guest 245:5
guidance 28:15 41:2 116:11
guide 19:3 20:11 24:1 35:1 51:1 53:10 116:8 136:10
guided 54:19
guidelines 50:10 52:10 52:13 203:15
guides 113:16
guiding 113:18
gut 139:12

H

half 116:18 202:19 232:17
hall 27:19 28:3,7,21 29:3 43:14 69:16
hallmarks 239:2
hammered 101:3
hand 114:13 164:20 165:9,10 175:10 179:14
hand-in-glove 148:18
hand-in-hand 83:21 89:17
handed 163:14
handle 205:15
hands 17:18 213:14
handwriting 214:18 216:3
hangar 3:11 13:2,5
happen 49:6 80:6 84:2 151:22
happened 17:1 78:10 105:17 139:2 159:6
happening 91:18 104:2 104:3 226:11,12
happier 78:11
happy 16:19 17:1 71:10 91:14 110:21 188:8
hard 8:3 53:14 59:5 77:13 137:21 143:3 206:17
Hart 2:13 163:9,10 188:1 196:18,21 197:8 198:9,21 199:18 201:15
hat 102:2
hated 192:4
haunted 137:6
Haupt 29:10 30:12 37:21 39:10 57:1,3,11 60:10 61:19 67:21 91:5 97:17 98:8
head 10:15
health 41:22
healthy 70:21
hear 16:3 58:1 103:17 147:9 254:18 255:7
heard 38:13 82:10 87:1 88:16 92:20 98:20 201:20 204:8 251:19
hearing 17:4 83:13 84:19 107:4 111:13 161:9,18 216:12 228:21 258:16
heart 54:11 135:19 236:10
heavily 127:17
heeded 100:15
height 37:13 122:15 132:10 170:1 194:12
heights 125:11
held 11:15 32:9 44:2
help 7:1 27:14 32:17 33:10,16 41:13,21 43:20 45:21 47:11,22 104:9 118:6,20 129:9 131:22 153:12 160:21 188:6 207:11 213:5 242:17,18 246:17 257:12
helped 74:21 131:12 160:20
helpful 21:13 41:4 78:16,17
helping 115:19 135:22 238:17
herd 255:14
hidden 58:1
high 26:22 40:14 76:22 95:11 252:8
high-density 182:17
higher 195:5 206:14
highest 168:16
highlight 38:3 109:21 190:2 245:14 248:20
highlighting 26:9 247:14
highlights 41:1
highly 131:3 154:5
Highway 203:14
Hirshhorn 20:5 21:7 22:11 25:13 46:5,7,14 49:4 91:10
historic 2:17 19:20 20:2 20:13 23:14 36:3 42:18 44:13 49:12,15 51:3 54:2,3,10 56:15 58:10 79:2,4,19 106:14 119:19 122:8 130:2,5,6 143:15,18 143:19,21 167:20 171:11 221:20,22 232:22,22 234:1,2,5,9 235:13 236:12 238:4 238:7 242:13 243:22 247:18 248:2,4,6
historical 160:15
historically 117:17
history 41:11 80:19 115:19 135:16 148:3 164:15 224:3 231:15 239:6,9
Hoffmann 60:4,18 77:6
hold 115:18 135:4 214:17
holding 11:7
holds 127:13
hole 16:4
holes 65:18
home 54:11 68:22 136:22 137:3 166:7 182:16
honest 153:19
honestly 82:15,20 197:8
honor 137:18 153:14 161:11
honored 162:19
honoring 162:11
hook 120:20
hope 6:22 92:4,17,22 93:2 100:14 101:12 102:10,21 103:8 137:14,16 151:1 154:10 189:2 191:16 192:2 205:9 253:12 253:17
hopeful 131:10
hopefully 104:8 152:1 223:16
hoping 252:18
Horvath 18:8 53:2,3 60:16 68:18 71:18 75:4,20 81:9 82:5,8 82:12 84:6,17 85:2 86:15 87:20 88:10,18

91:1 100:1
hospitality 6:15 231:4 258:18
hosts 7:3
Hotel 226:9
hours 6:12 59:11 109:18 139:20
house 1:17 8:9 11:11 31:19 95:1 123:2,14 188:18
households 70:9
houses 11:7,15
housing 246:21
Houston 210:7
hub 27:7
huge 255:14
human 254:15
hundred 115:14
hundreds 59:14 139:20

I

I-295 4:5 163:2 166:22 172:10 177:2
I-66 127:10
iconic 26:18 54:9 168:3
idea 94:13 96:7,9 147:13 155:20 166:10 202:6 226:17
ideas 100:7,10,11 148:10 175:8 188:22
identified 21:16 30:6 49:3 50:17 121:15 123:10 181:2,11 239:1 243:20 245:1
identifies 234:4
identify 19:5 48:20 57:13 131:12 248:14 248:15
identifying 210:12
II 148:5
illuminated 43:1
illustrate 102:13 186:2
illustrations 209:17
image 22:4 31:4 39:19 43:2 78:14 104:20 130:2 166:12 169:5,8 169:12 170:20 174:7 179:15
images 117:13 174:19 178:22 179:12 199:4
imagine 206:17 251:5 252:16
imagined 56:18
immediate 206:19 243:20
immediately 127:1 128:22
impact 18:18 23:8 30:6 33:17 37:8 44:21 54:6 91:10 95:15 119:7,9 170:11,17 172:2 183:5 221:5,12 223:13
impacts 23:5,10 33:12 49:12,21 51:12 52:2 119:15 170:13 171:7 171:14 183:11 221:15 223:4,9 239:15 241:18 249:1
impervious 243:4 253:18
implement 18:20
implementation 30:2 49:11 50:2 247:3 249:5
implemented 19:6 35:9 38:7 48:21 49:1 87:7 123:17
implementing 50:7 138:18
implied 120:12
importance 151:9 167:11 176:5 178:1
important 17:13 19:19 21:4 26:19 27:9 28:3 33:22 39:7 42:2 50:7 54:11 55:1 56:11 76:3 83:5,5 91:20 97:20 99:9 111:1 116:12 118:3 143:17 152:18 154:18 159:10 164:12 165:4,17 172:16 177:20 180:21,22 181:19 184:14 206:8 210:19 217:11
importantly 40:16
imposed 170:20
imposing 199:1
impressed 77:2
improve 24:16 30:20 31:12 46:9 47:11 51:20 55:20 128:20 232:4 239:13 243:11
improved 29:3,17 32:16 33:10 46:1 104:6 118:21 119:3 178:5 182:2 245:9
improvement 72:7 74:4 101:1 103:17 188:21 245:19
improvements 3:20 4:12 12:2,16 19:12 25:7 27:12 32:14 40:1 47:2,7 108:12 129:1 217:20 218:1 245:15 246:10,21
improving 20:14,17 28:22
impulse 154:21
inadequate 70:19 240:7
inappropriate 144:8
inches 168:22
Incidents 71:2
incision 256:2
include 20:13 23:17 38:2 47:3 84:12 120:5 124:22 162:16 168:11 171:10 183:9 234:9
included 22:3 36:9 52:7 52:9 71:22 170:9 174:2 178:22
includes 40:19 50:16 70:7 99:5 168:6 170:19 172:10
including 21:6,20 24:21 28:8,20 29:1,8 31:15 32:14 34:17 35:3 43:11 44:3 47:15 50:18 52:2 53:16 54:1 57:11 72:10 81:16 113:20 117:14 118:9 123:6 124:9 132:21 166:21 171:17,18 179:3 221:10 222:16 223:9 234:6 235:19 243:21 248:11 251:3
inconsistent 83:12
incorporate 93:5 167:4
incorporated 32:20 80:7 169:10 175:2
incorporates 120:21 121:6
incorporating 175:4,12 176:18
incorrect 65:12
increase 204:17 243:15 244:12 247:6 249:8
increased 32:15 74:20 204:2
increases 235:15
increasing 54:16 71:2 252:17
indefinitely 67:7
Independence 19:17 20:7 33:3 34:18 35:6 35:13 37:18 51:7 74:13 93:22 95:19 96:5 100:4,9 110:13
independent 167:17 244:15
independently 114:8
indicated 24:20 33:20 116:16
indirectly 162:3
individual 19:8,13 30:3 33:14 40:11 49:10 52:12 56:2 72:4 81:19 82:9 83:10 155:2 163:19
individually 162:18 167:3
industrial 232:1
Industries 20:4 21:6 24:10 36:11,13 42:14 44:11 45:18 46:14 53:19 58:18 79:17 80:21 81:17 94:2 106:12
industry 62:14
inefficient 235:6
infiltration 38:5 65:22
influenced 21:8,10
information 11:18 18:22 28:14 42:16 50:16 114:16 175:15 175:19 177:5,15 182:6 185:4 208:14 208:16 216:5 221:9 222:15 230:22 231:15 247:2,8,10 249:5,12 249:14
informed 209:20
infrastructure 128:14 243:2
inherent 71:8
initial 22:2 24:12 25:16 51:13 113:1 139:5,12 196:12
initially 40:17
initiated 23:11
initiating 42:20
initiatives 75:14
inject 67:1
injected 66:16
injection 65:17 66:5,7,7 66:10,11 67:6
inlet 65:1
innovating 248:2
innovation 232:1
innovative 59:1
input 25:3 52:15 76:1
insert 5:8 7:4 12:20 13:5 15:6 52:22 72:12 73:9 108:14 134:4 142:9 146:15 186:18 187:9 218:11 222:13 249:19
insertion 222:18
insertions 43:8
inside 63:5 254:9
insignificant 259:12
insist 84:14

inspection 240:13,22 241:4,14
inspections 239:20 240:9
inspiration 178:22
inspired 137:15 227:3
install 22:15 156:16
installation 180:12
installations 248:16
installed 38:10 63:6 68:11 119:18 171:15
Institute 4:16 117:8 118:9 145:10 230:14 230:20 231:11
institution 3:17,19 17:22 18:4,11 19:21 27:3 28:11 44:8 51:9 56:12 92:1 93:14 95:6 97:14 103:12 110:9
institution's 75:13
insulation 62:2,5 64:1
integral 116:4
integrate 45:18 130:11
integrated 131:16 145:19
integration 75:13
integrity 91:12 238:6
intend 82:3,8,22 160:1 160:4
intended 19:2 23:3 34:22 50:22 64:11,16 129:22 235:19 243:11
intending 209:9
intense 139:20
intensity 144:5 171:1
intent 48:18 67:1 141:3 174:18 178:18
intention 56:14 94:10 96:13 99:3
intentions 55:2
intently 55:7
interacts 156:5
interchange 4:5 163:3 167:1 172:11 177:2
interest 52:17 71:18 76:21 141:14 143:11 188:17 222:8
interested 50:5 97:12 175:19 222:2 258:6
interesting 161:5
interfere 114:1
interior 1:16 3:21 38:8 43:9 59:3 63:17,18 67:12,16 144:11 238:3
intermingle 240:14
intermingled 240:7
internal 21:19 237:5
international 51:8 115:11 116:4 136:16
interpretive 29:4,18 185:3
intersection 122:19 128:18
intersections 128:6 213:4
Interstate 232:11
interventions 43:12
interwoven 236:15
intimacy 132:1
intimate 22:7 39:5 40:15 116:13 127:14
intra-connected 242:22
introduce 60:3 68:19 191:9
introduced 166:10
introduction 92:21 124:11 178:3
intruding 64:17
intrusion 63:18,19 67:15
intrusive 34:16
intuitive 128:5
investigating 204:9
investigation 60:19
investment 59:2 77:3
invitation 90:12,13
invite 97:8 98:12 103:6 155:6
invited 57:12 88:4,15 89:8
invites 84:22
inviting 35:9 94:6 103:14 202:6 213:15
involve 211:1
involved 138:18
involving 54:22
iron 95:11 100:8
ironically 101:10
irresponsible 71:19
island 127:7 174:15
isolate 127:11
isolated 62:11
isolation 101:5
issue 109:10 151:6 171:13 193:22 200:15
issues 31:11 38:3 77:15 81:22 85:7 89:16 101:2 104:11 111:10 131:12 132:2 198:12 224:4 250:6
item 6:9 11:2 12:5,12 12:14 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:13 17:4,16,19 18:2 108:9 112:8 158:9 163:6 217:22 230:17 230:18
items 3:7,16 12:11,13 17:13,21 212:15 259:11
iterations 41:11

J

jail 95:12
January 8:6 18:6 53:15 65:5 79:7,11 81:11 88:9 90:10
Jefferson 19:18 20:8 22:16 47:6 61:7
jewel 58:1
job 56:6 82:16 86:2 110:7 192:3 230:11 240:10
Johnnetta 57:20
Johnson's 144:16
join 5:6
joint 3:11 13:3 137:1 164:19 173:10
Joni 250:14
Jr 1:10,13 144:18
JULIA 2:14
jurisdiction 90:8 173:9 173:11 221:1 224:14

K

Kadlubowski 60:4,10 60:13,15 68:19
keep 10:11 16:4 56:20 76:7 109:19 110:11 143:12,20,21 157:20 225:6
keeping 39:17 143:11
keeps 9:19,20 64:6
Kelley 68:20 69:3,4,5 71:17
Kennedy 123:14 127:3
KEVIN 1:17
key 59:19 245:14 247:14
kids 211:10 213:10
kill 255:5
killing 144:13
kinds 202:17 210:19
knee 96:18 98:5,6,16
knowing 66:13 197:21
known 24:13 34:1 49:18 164:18 231:12 236:22 237:10
knows 128:8
Korean 149:12
KOSTER 2:14 208:12 208:21 214:15,17,21 215:8 216:2 229:6
kudos 227:6
Kuwait 115:12 135:20 136:13,20

L

L 1:10,13,18
L'Arc 213:12
L'Enfant 58:6
lab 237:22
lab- 237:14
laboratories 239:1 254:14
laboratory 232:6 234:8
labs 233:8 237:16 244:7
lack 31:6 71:4 145:1
lacking 186:11
Lady 144:16
laid 6:19
lakes 250:20
land 55:17 113:9 154:3 166:16 173:7,7 250:19 251:7
landforms 145:17
landmark 42:18 43:5 51:20
landmarks 79:4,19 106:14
landowners 190:15
landscape 40:14 94:11 119:12 122:8 127:6 132:21 144:18 182:6 186:8 201:8 234:6 238:21 242:12 255:11
landscape=oriented 122:11
landscapes 185:10
landscaping 174:6 177:5 194:18 210:11 211:16 212:8 241:20 242:10 257:15
lane 169:16 207:14
lanes 168:11 169:6 207:9
language 106:16 222:3
large 22:19 33:8 40:17 42:21 43:15 44:5,9 51:17 59:1 79:15 104:22 121:8 122:21 169:22 170:1 175:16 199:6 208:1 234:7 242:15
large- 106:10
larger 33:2 45:6 57:2 125:15 172:7 234:16 245:22
largest 121:5 233:14
lastly 243:13 246:15 248:18 249:7
late 144:17 232:20

laterally 64:3,7,17
Laughter 109:17 110:20 112:5,14 149:1,6 154:16 160:3 161:7 163:12 188:13 192:7 197:5 198:6 200:9 205:2 208:19 220:2 228:14 250:7 256:4
law 3:8,9 12:16,18,20 113:6,16 136:18 138:17
lawn 22:19 51:17
lawn-type 22:5
lawns 179:2
laws 225:16
lay 190:22
layer 62:2,6 64:1
layout 40:10 139:13
lead 162:8
lead-up 235:12
leaders 136:11
leadership 10:3 86:18 92:3 137:15
leading 165:15 241:4
League 162:16
leak 65:21 66:1,4,8,17
leaking 31:7 65:5
leaks 38:5 62:8,10 66:9 66:20 68:14,16
leaning 223:12
learn 11:8 98:21 159:2 159:3 213:17
learned 55:21 140:11
learning 70:13 158:21
lease 16:22
leave 87:10 145:13 149:22
leaves 141:8 254:12
leaving 125:4
lecture 69:15
lecturers 69:8
led 115:11 160:19 168:2 254:7
Lee 2:15,17 108:13 109:18 112:3,6
left 84:13 89:20 120:20 157:18 165:10 166:13 169:5 175:10 179:14 212:14
left-hand 169:11
legacy 137:11 166:6 175:5
legislative 3:6 12:6,7
legitimate 206:22
LEIBNER 227:9
length 17:17 122:15 157:11
lens 56:8
lesser 34:1 125:5
let's 80:8 84:18 109:19 151:1 202:6 219:12
letter 72:11 77:5 80:11 81:10,14,16 82:21 86:6,20,22 88:8 89:1 90:10,10 136:18 138:17 148:22 149:9 160:1 163:17,18 193:2,3,4
letters 24:4 71:21 163:15 185:8
letting 101:22
levee 119:7 145:16
level 22:15 26:22 29:3 30:6 47:21 49:20 56:9 78:7 79:16 106:11 176:3 244:10
levels 75:3 204:8
liberate 136:20
liberating 135:19
library 61:3,3,5,7 244:4
life 38:1 44:3 68:12 124:22 150:22 151:1 175:1,5 209:18 210:6 213:14 227:21 232:5
lifted 227:18
light 29:11 58:16 71:5 96:14 101:22 102:11 103:1 171:1,1 208:21 224:6 241:21 249:8 254:15 256:22
lighten 228:18
lighting 170:14,17 171:9,14,16,19,21 172:4,6 177:6,8 183:5 183:8,12,13 185:1 188:15 198:12 199:12 200:1,2 208:22 209:12 214:22 215:2 215:6,7,9,10 219:10 220:9,14,19 221:10 221:18 222:5,8,15 224:4,17 226:10 242:8 258:2
likes 136:3
Likewise 165:12
limited 24:21 25:14 46:22 71:11 127:14 128:14 155:10 157:13 224:15
limiting 126:4
Lincoln 117:7,10,15 118:18 119:12,20,21 120:10 122:8 145:11
line 9:20 55:12 74:19 96:5 129:11 150:14 151:3 206:13 222:22 223:2 246:3
linear 123:13
lined 256:8
lines 164:10 181:12
link 41:10 123:13 165:1
links 47:4 118:21
list 72:12 142:9 154:20 236:2 246:15,19
listed 21:5 138:22
listened 55:7
listening 91:1 92:2 155:16
listing 232:21 233:22
lit 102:9 199:3,3 214:1
literal 155:6,7
literally 223:13
little 95:12 102:2 103:2 115:9 131:8 157:3,3 158:2 163:21 188:16 190:13 197:20 222:4 222:13 223:12 236:8 256:6,16
live 6:5 246:13
lives 115:14
load 109:12
loaded 201:7
loading 20:17 45:20
loads 243:6
local 32:7 70:8 74:21 162:14 176:12,19 236:5 246:2
located 19:15 29:16,20 30:11,19 35:7 37:12 64:5 69:16 113:11 117:6,8,10 119:22 120:3 122:18 123:4 123:21,22 126:21 128:1 137:17 145:16 174:11 175:18 176:8 231:20 233:15 237:1 240:1
locating 113:22 114:2
location 26:18 27:5 30:14 36:6 37:10 64:13 66:12,18 81:1 117:17,21 118:4,17 120:20 121:20 126:17 130:15 131:21 132:14 138:21 139:3 141:4 141:13 144:8 145:5 150:13 152:12,12 153:7 171:2 174:19
locations 34:4 37:16 62:11 66:15 96:15 99:8 213:4 241:9
lock 93:8
logic 150:8
long 16:18 59:11 117:12 126:3 162:21 168:6 202:14 227:22 227:22 259:11
long-term 18:15 51:1
longer 40:16 63:14 64:16 68:12 70:16 170:11 252:3
longer-term 117:19
look 65:7 75:12 79:1 95:6,16 96:9 100:10 101:13 102:10 148:3 148:6 152:6 153:20 155:4 157:11 175:9 189:1 201:6 211:16 212:2 213:7 220:7 235:13 252:9 256:7 256:13
looked 108:5 194:10 205:13 209:2 256:21
looking 35:15,16 36:12 36:19,22 100:7 114:22 120:16 121:11 125:9 128:16 135:9 157:9,12,14,21 159:7 161:6 165:6,13 182:8 197:15 198:10 201:3 203:21,21 204:16 207:7
looks 88:11 191:2 257:9
lose 152:16 154:21 255:2,2
loss 42:5 133:18
lost 251:1
lot 6:19 84:19 92:15,20 94:22 95:7 98:9 100:21 102:17 148:6 148:7,13 151:6 154:18 157:16,17,19 158:1 189:10,14 193:6 200:22 201:8 207:2,3 220:10 225:4 227:5 251:1,3,22 253:3,16,18,21 254:10 257:14,15
lots 107:19 244:9 253:7
love 102:15 103:12 110:18 150:2 221:11 228:5 251:6 255:15 255:22
loved 227:10 255:19
lovely 229:8
low 96:10 198:20
low-density 173:10,14
lower 79:16 106:11 149:17,18 196:8 258:1

lowered 103:7
lowering 196:1
Lytle 191:7,11,12 192:12 193:14 194:3 196:6,12,15 203:11 209:8 211:12 214:4,6 214:12,20 217:17

M

macabre 157:3,10
magenta 245:17
main 26:21 74:14 179:18,22 244:3
maintain 8:14 54:16 58:9 70:20 240:5
maintained 26:1 91:12
maintaining 40:14 239:9
maintains 235:16 238:6
major 54:22 131:15 136:3 162:16 164:10 166:3,8 178:12 180:11
majority 24:5 38:16 55:18 69:1,14
makeshift 38:7
making 32:11 70:5 100:12 107:1 110:3 128:7 161:12 190:15 248:20
mall 3:17,18 18:1,4,12 19:16 20:2,8,11 26:19 27:4,9 28:5 34:2,7,7 34:12 35:13 38:20 39:7,9 42:9 47:22 52:22 53:8 54:10 71:14 98:7,11 100:2 103:21 113:13 118:13 127:12 128:13 133:12 144:4 145:6 151:17 151:21 157:4,13,18
manage 43:19 199:12
managed 193:6
management 175:13,14 175:17,22 185:5 199:13 242:13,21 245:7 246:16 247:1,9 248:15 249:4,13 255:4
Manager 191:12
manicured 248:13
manner 45:10 233:4 235:20
map 194:17 231:19 250:17
MARCEL 2:11
March 137:1 139:21
mark 173:4
market 179:1,13 226:13
Mary 57:3
Marybeth 68:20 69:2,5
Maryland 3:12 13:3 14:4,4 230:15 231:12 231:21 234:1 243:5
massive 252:18
master 3:18 4:18 6:17 6:22 18:1,3,5,12,15 18:21 19:2,4,10 20:10 21:1,9,13 22:2,22 23:4,10,19 24:2,12 25:21 26:6,9 30:7 31:12 34:22 38:2 40:18,19 45:17 46:6 46:15 47:13 48:19 49:20 50:6,15,15,22 51:15,19 52:6,9,22 53:7,9 54:18 55:9,14 59:19 74:7 77:20 78:6 81:6 82:4 83:7 84:21 88:12 90:12 99:5 107:17,18 124:21 230:16,19 231:10,17 234:4 235:5,16 236:3 236:7 239:3 244:14 244:19,21 245:8 246:17 253:1 256:1 258:3,22
match 242:5
material 67:2,6,8 251:15
materials 39:11 41:12 48:2 63:5 92:15
math 87:15 194:9
matrix 63:10
Matt 97:22 112:11 139:10 140:8
Matt's 56:6 100:6
matter 76:4 77:22 87:12 90:8,16,21 146:13 205:5 211:21 259:14
matters 90:17
MATTHEW 2:12
mature 152:5
maximize 25:6 238:10
May's 85:16 86:9
Mayor 1:19
Mayoral 1:15
meadow 243:16 248:13
meadows 173:22 242:17
mean 82:16 83:3 92:12 92:13 95:7 99:17,19 102:19 106:3 140:3,8 147:12 149:7 151:15 153:18 188:10 192:1 197:8 198:15 199:15 199:18,22 200:2,3 206:12,16,22 215:4 224:1,8,16 227:16,22 228:16 254:7
meandering 174:1
meaningful 155:2
means 62:17 93:5 147:5 255:5
measurement 232:2,5
measures 30:2 38:4,7 241:21 248:3
meat 148:12
mechanical 58:12
media 136:3
meet 18:15 23:4 24:17 32:18 76:16 102:22 138:3 175:19 185:4 240:6 243:3 244:22 248:9
meeting 1:3,9 5:5 6:4,6 10:20 17:18 18:6 38:13 60:8 65:4 81:11 86:7 91:18 92:12 160:4 193:8 194:4,6 195:8,12,18,20 218:6 239:10 252:5
meetings 23:13 159:14 159:16
member 3:4 8:21 57:13 70:8 220:1
members 1:12 18:10 22:17 38:14 50:5 52:20 53:4,5 60:1 107:6 108:1 115:13 118:2 164:2 188:21 231:8
membrane 62:1,5 63:1 63:22 64:2,10,14,15 64:20 68:5
membranes 62:20 67:10
memorial's 149:19
memorializing 155:1
memorials 113:16 114:1 118:7,13,22 122:1 123:16,20 124:20 128:3 130:15 131:18 132:16 144:4 145:8 147:9,16 148:3 150:21 152:18 153:21 155:5
mention 46:17 135:3 255:15
mentioned 18:10 29:21 30:8 37:17,22 40:6 50:16 51:22 52:10 53:9 115:22 118:8 119:6 131:14 132:2 136:22 140:9,20 141:1 143:14 145:7 145:13 156:18 180:3
messages 83:12
met 75:4 81:11 85:4 86:18 135:11 194:4
Metro 65:9 228:8,10,11 246:3 253:20
mic 255:8
MICHAEL 1:18 2:18
mid- 56:18 234:2
mid-1940s 164:16
mid-century 254:8
middle 25:4 98:6,14
migrate 63:9 152:14
miles 107:15 253:20
military 115:18 116:3 136:10,20 137:10 158:1,3 161:6 162:5
million 54:9 162:17 232:14 235:9
Mina 1:22 159:1
mind 104:6 151:13 152:20 157:21 193:14
mindful 254:12
mine 68:20 147:19
minimal 24:15 76:15 91:10 234:11 240:4
minimize 33:16 119:15 239:14 241:18 248:22
minimized 26:3
minimizes 122:12
minimizing 23:5 25:5 50:1 51:12
minimum 203:18,19 204:17
minor 119:9 258:10
minute 10:21 214:17
minutes 212:14
missing 71:20
mission 42:12 57:5 141:15 213:2 231:21 248:1
Mitchell 250:14
mitigating 50:1
mix 234:8 236:4 238:22
mixture 201:2 237:8
mode 247:2 249:4
modern 28:13 32:12 232:19 234:3 254:8
modernization 235:6
modernizing 20:17
modes 123:8
modest 167:7
Modifications 3:9
modified 48:3
moisture 63:8,11
moment 84:11 190:5

201:4 206:17
moments 189:12 226:4
monitoring 247:4 249:6
monitors 96:14
monolithic 122:16 131:17 234:11
monomer 62:4
Montgomery 231:21
month 10:22 11:10,17 11:22 54:7 193:6
months 55:6 60:2
monty 149:9
Monument 120:12
monumental 27:11 118:18 123:11 170:15 172:2,7 234:7 238:22
motion 9:4 105:15 106:19 111:13 161:12 161:14 215:12 216:12 228:22 229:10 258:21
Mount 217:18 222:10
move 9:18 16:2,20 81:19 91:13 105:6,11 138:3 172:8,13,20 177:1,12 179:18 195:1 202:16 206:13 215:13 258:7 259:2
moved 9:5 16:9,11 17:3 25:11 70:10 79:8 107:2,10,12,20 111:15,17 161:17 215:16 216:14,16 217:2,4 229:1,2,3,12 229:14 230:2,4 259:4
movement 91:7 100:22
movements 203:16,18
moves 107:8 225:19 243:14
moving 22:16 31:17 37:20 42:13 122:17 194:17,21 195:12,17 202:18 213:2 240:1
Muddy 234:17 240:2 241:17 245:20
multi-mobile 170:2
multi-use 210:8 212:5
multiple 117:4 172:11 204:8
multipurpose 69:19
multiuse 3:15 15:3
murder/suicide 213:1
museum 3:9,19 12:17 12:20 22:12 29:15 30:17 33:21 42:20 46:7,10,21 47:2,4,12 49:4 57:21 58:1,21 61:15 63:19 69:20 81:2 108:8,13,14 251:3,11
museum's 124:21
museums 20:15,18 21:21 28:9 30:18 31:21 33:6 34:1 44:16 57:8,15 69:14,19 74:18,20 98:12

N

N.W 1:10 122:20
name 69:5 74:2
named 125:1
names 154:20 155:2
naming 8:10 149:13 155:11
narrative 92:15
narrower 96:12
nation 136:8,12 137:3
nation's 135:17 162:4
national 1:1,12 3:8,9,12 3:17,19,21,21 4:16 5:4 9:12 12:16,18,20 14:4 19:16 20:2,8 21:5 26:19 27:9 28:5 29:14 30:16 33:21 34:2,7,7 35:13 39:9 42:18 47:22 54:1 57:21 61:15 65:4 79:3 79:18 106:14 108:8 108:12,14 112:7,10 112:16,17 113:7,12 114:3 118:13 127:12 127:20 128:13 133:12 134:4 135:7,17 137:6 138:4 141:12 143:6,7 162:15 165:8 166:3 173:9 176:12,18 221:16 230:14,19 231:10 232:21 233:22
Nationals 178:3 181:1
nations 120:22 136:18
native 41:20
natural 29:11 43:1 58:16 71:5 172:6 173:13 174:6 233:11 238:18
natural-looking 250:19
nature 26:18 195:15 211:14 212:3 226:13 247:19
Navy 3:11 13:4
NCMAC 154:19
NCPC 2:9 11:15,22 59:22 83:14 89:4,6,16 138:1 147:20 167:12 167:19 171:10 178:11 183:2,9 220:22 221:3 224:3 238:12,19 241:13 246:21 247:8 249:11
NCPC's 90:8 166:9 177:20 244:22 245:11
NCPC-CFA 167:16
ncpc.gov 6:5
Neal 141:21 143:1 145:22 159:11
Neal's 149:9
near 27:8 118:4,7,18 122:19 123:22 237:17
near-term 59:5
nearby 64:13 118:13 122:1 131:3 144:11 176:14 179:4 246:2,8 246:20
nearing 38:1
nearly 136:6
neat 251:13
necessarily 76:16 151:14 155:11 158:22 197:17 204:22 205:3
necessary 59:3 60:9 68:5 129:1 177:9 197:22 219:10,15
necessitate 40:7
need 24:8 44:9 65:7 77:9,10 96:13 98:6,16 99:1 109:9,15,20 135:22 143:4 147:11 149:17,18 154:7 155:19 175:17 178:8 200:12,21 207:9 208:15 214:1 218:7 224:3 254:15
needed 157:20 228:2
needs 20:12 32:18 33:18 42:11 48:10,15 51:2 66:1 87:17 97:13 121:15 174:11 184:1 204:6,13 227:17,18 239:10 240:6 246:12
negative 67:13,14
negotiating 53:21
neighborhood 35:14 58:5 75:1,8,14 149:16 178:2,16 180:8 182:17 184:3 220:17 221:19,22 223:8,11 225:19 226:14 237:3 241:19
neighborhoods 34:20 35:3 165:16 176:21 246:2 249:2
neighbors 58:4 221:19 224:11
net 42:5 247:5 248:16
network 118:15,22 127:10 128:13 169:19 233:12 243:9,11
networks 45:19
Neuberg 6:14 231:4 258:16
never 56:18 82:20 136:4 145:1 227:18
new 3:11 13:5 29:4,8,9 32:1,19,21 34:4 36:16 37:16 40:6 45:14,20 45:21 46:1 47:15 48:4 68:8,10,14 93:5,5 96:1 110:12 139:18 147:16 168:10 170:7 170:19 178:8 202:22 208:2 235:10 236:15 236:16,17 237:1,4,7 237:11,14,19,20 238:2,15 242:1,2,6,17 244:6,9 245:17 247:18 248:3,13,22 249:12 257:5
newly 58:8 164:17 165:9
NFL 162:16
nice 141:22 151:18
night 170:8 198:4 199:3
nine 86:1
ninth 8:4
NIST 6:13,17 7:2,4 231:12,15,16,19,21 233:21 234:19 235:5 236:12 237:18 239:6 239:12 240:17 241:6 241:17,22 244:9 245:4,12,16 246:1,7 246:11,13,17,22 247:6,8,17 248:21,21 249:2,9,13,18,19 252:1 253:12 257:12
NIST's 235:11 238:18 240:6 241:13 242:11 243:3,8,13 248:1,5,8 249:8
nod 10:15
noise 129:16 242:19
noisy 144:5
nominate 9:1
nomination 8:18,19
nominations 9:10
non- 70:2
non-federal 245:9 247:5 249:7
non-historic 43:11
non-regulatory 232:6
non-single 246:18
noon 11:14
normal 87:3

north 19:18 20:9 31:18 36:22 37:12 74:14 117:7,8 119:22 127:3 145:11 169:6 179:20 180:2 184:14 233:2 237:6 256:10
north- 179:22
north-site 179:19
north-south 180:20
northeast 102:1 120:4 174:13 183:22 232:11 233:15
northeast-southwest 179:21 180:21 184:15
northern 74:19 121:9
northward 165:6
northwest 125:10
notable 60:22 236:2,7
notably 61:9
note 6:4 8:1 11:20 17:12 50:8 71:21 116:17 119:16 124:20 130:22 132:16 133:9 133:16 159:10 160:16 163:17 174:7,21 182:13 183:2 184:13 189:8 190:7 208:2,3 208:12 213:20 225:22 226:2,21 238:14 252:22
noted 172:22 173:1 177:17 191:20 231:1
notes 40:8 178:10 183:7,11
noticed 6:8
noting 131:1
notion 155:1
notwithstanding 100:21
November 164:8 183:3 185:8,21 193:2 194:5 196:19
number 6:11,21 11:2 12:5,12 20:12 23:14 28:17 44:2 50:17 58:3 72:9 122:6 128:6 166:20 171:21 177:18 180:3 224:11 231:2 234:4 235:12,18 239:4 259:11
numbers 54:17
numerically 105:1
numerous 17:13 21:20 24:4 62:10
nurse 144:12
nutrient 243:6
NW 217:18

O

O 226:12
o'clock 17:20
O'Dell 227:10
objection 10:14
objective 136:20,21 162:10
objectives 76:16
obligated 70:2
obligations 53:22
observations 150:17
obstacles 140:19
obstruct 154:4
obtained 136:16
obviously 123:21 160:21 228:1
occupant 246:18
occupants 63:4
occupies 121:5 123:1
occupy 116:18 141:10
occur 66:12,17 68:14
occurred 62:10 82:20 86:4 114:8,9
October 185:7,9 193:3 193:4
odd 201:2
off-site 242:19 249:1
offensive 221:18
offer 118:19 205:9
offerings 59:9 69:21
office 1:14,19 8:9,18 31:19 60:5 123:5 124:9 167:20 171:11 179:4 189:8,22 221:21 227:3,7 237:15
office-only 237:16
Officer 54:3
officers 3:8 8:3 12:18
offices 11:15 69:1
officially 144:9
Officials 203:15
old 38:1 63:15 232:18
omit 105:20
omitted 106:17
on- 239:13
on-campus 241:8 247:6
on-site 243:11
once 10:22 28:2 57:22 65:21 136:21 218:5 227:6 246:12 254:19 255:7
one-sided 202:2
ones 78:19
online 106:4
OP 190:15 225:22
open 1:5 6:19 11:7,9,11 11:14 17:11 22:5,19 37:17,18 40:17 42:22 43:15 51:17 55:2 97:7 99:12 100:16 114:2 119:12 125:5 126:2 130:10 144:1 154:4 166:3,10 169:1,1 173:22 176:14 179:1 180:4 191:16 238:18 247:19 251:16 253:8
opened 164:17 165:2
opening 46:16,22 91:16 98:15 151:11
openings 94:13
openness 39:8
opens 34:11 35:12,22
operating 74:9 183:8 242:18
Operation 115:9 136:1 137:8
operational 18:17 171:8 209:10 215:2,7 215:9 246:13
operations 115:16 235:21
opine 150:1
opinion 65:10 68:1 77:8
opportunities 29:5,19 29:20,22 41:9,17 48:5 118:19 239:20 251:2
opportunity 28:12 30:15 55:20 71:15 111:8 114:5 124:7 126:1 127:14 140:9 145:17,20 147:7 162:8 173:2 176:11 182:18 205:7 231:2 246:11
opposed 9:15 17:8 78:21 107:7 108:2 112:1 152:14 161:21 216:20 217:8 229:18 230:8 259:8
opposite 159:5 225:5
optimistic 59:13
option 239:16,17,22 240:10,17
options 184:18 240:4,4
orangish-red 236:20
Orchard 245:16
order 6:7 55:13 84:11 172:1
organization 74:9 138:7 141:14
orientation 28:12
oriented 121:4 132:22 180:4 233:4
original 26:5 27:15 43:13 44:13 45:7 48:17 56:13 66:22 91:7 105:5,15 110:15 119:19
originally 64:16 164:16
ornamentation 234:11
ORTIZ 1:17
Oscar 250:5
other's 109:22
ought 200:15
outcome 30:5
outcomes 235:19
outdoor 237:2
outer 168:18 196:2 198:19
outgrown 70:1
outlined 132:21
outside 62:21 63:1 176:9 183:17 204:12 221:3 241:7 242:16 245:13
oval 166:11 172:22,22 173:2,6,13,19,20,21 174:3,14,18 175:3,12 176:5,11,13,16 177:12,15 178:9,12 178:14,21 179:6,8,12 179:16 180:10,13,14 180:17 181:1,14 184:2,13 189:11,19 190:7 194:19 195:1 212:2 213:10
ovals 166:21 172:10 175:6 177:14 185:1,2 186:10 195:10,14 200:17 201:1 207:17 209:16 211:17 212:18 212:19
over-arching 167:22
overall 20:10 121:11 130:18 172:4 183:13 184:20 194:18 212:3 220:22 234:21 244:21 245:10 257:3 258:7
overarching 54:19 242:11
overbuilding 239:22
overburden 62:7 67:7
overcome 130:21
overlapping 257:1
overlay 184:6
overlays 183:15
overlooks 168:13 169:9
Oversight 1:17
oversized 34:3
overview 114:6
owners 190:9
ownership 177:22
Owning 102:19

oy 254:8

P

P 4:6 163:3
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 5:1
p.m 1:10 5:2 11:12 259:15
PA 49:15,22 50:6,11
package 110:3
packet 72:10
packets 252:11
page 96:19,19 98:1 207:20 214:21 221:8 222:20 256:9,15,15 256:16,17 257:9
painful 85:21 90:4
paint 193:22
pairs 170:1 196:2 208:1
panel 248:16
pans 38:9
parade 158:3 160:18 161:6
parades 158:1
paradise 250:15
paragraph 222:21 223:1
parallel 116:10
parameters 183:8
parapet 211:20
parcel 141:4
parcels 173:17
Paris 213:13
park 3:12,13,21 11:9 14:5 47:8 54:1 76:13 76:20 112:16 115:5 116:7 117:3 122:18 123:4,13,19,22 124:8 124:17 125:1,13 127:8 128:15 133:1,6 143:6 144:10,19,20 145:15 151:7 173:3,8 173:9 176:4 178:4,19 179:6,17 180:1,7 184:5 188:15 253:3,6 253:7
park-like 117:14
parking 234:7,21,22 235:1,4 238:9,11,12 244:22 246:12 247:6 249:9,12 251:19 252:10,14,17,21 253:7,8,11
parkland 232:12
parks 213:10
parkway 4:5 126:22 127:17 163:3 164:13 164:15,22 167:1 172:11 176:9 177:2
parrots 147:12
part 15:3 34:18 44:3 57:13 58:4 68:13 75:17 87:15 123:12 135:7 141:5 147:5 152:2 153:14 157:1 160:16 164:20 203:13 211:1 244:7 257:2
parterre 25:9 35:17 40:9 94:16
participant 48:8
participated 115:14
participation 60:1
particular 9:3 58:10 79:4 81:22 89:20 91:1 109:5,10 190:3
particularly 22:18 28:4 40:3 45:8 116:12 128:11 158:20 189:11 196:1
parties 23:13 49:13 50:4 59:22 75:22 195:13 209:11
partner 226:22 227:7
partners 87:13 162:14
partnership 8:15
parts 165:18 166:18 183:16 233:14,15 238:16
party 71:19
PAs 49:17
pass 47:6 163:22 227:13
passed 217:5 259:10
passing 144:5
passionate 70:13
passive 124:10 173:21 174:19 176:7 179:1 183:17
path 151:5 168:12,13 202:13 204:4,5,11,18 204:19 208:4 209:21 242:4
paths 151:8 169:8 203:12,19 211:17
pathway 169:15 185:2 201:18
pathways 174:1,19 180:4 205:7
Patrick 72:6,7 74:3
pattern 238:5,21 242:7
pavers 62:6 242:5
pavilion 34:4,6,10 36:21 37:16 101:15 102:2 104:3
pavilions 24:11,22 25:10 30:18 31:17 34:3,13,15 35:7,12,22 36:7,9,13,16,18 37:1 37:5,8,11 40:5 50:21 53:18 57:15 78:20 79:15 91:15 94:4 99:17 102:16 103:3 103:14,18,20 106:10
paving 257:19
pay 190:10
PDF 106:4
Peace 117:8 118:9 145:10
pedestrian 33:10 118:12 128:3,14 144:6 145:5 151:18 168:12 169:7,15 174:5,8 175:11 179:17 180:22 181:16 181:19 201:18,21 202:1 203:12,16,17 203:22 204:4,18 208:4 211:17 212:18 216:6 236:20 238:3 242:1 243:12 245:14 257:5,14
pedestrian-bicycle 174:13
pedestrian-free 257:21
pedestrian-height 242:8
pedestrian-only 242:9
pedestrian-scaled 258:1
pedestrians 128:21 140:9 202:5,21 205:4 205:12 206:12 207:12 210:2,18 212:7 258:8
penetration 64:8
Pennsylvania 153:6 158:6
people 54:17 59:14,18 62:4 70:12 78:14 94:6 95:9 97:8 98:17 99:18 102:20 111:9 116:2 136:13 150:18,22 151:4,10,22 153:13 153:14,17 156:2 159:3 160:16,20 169:12 205:10,11,14 205:16,17,18 207:3 210:13 211:2,9 212:20 213:9,15 218:8 220:21 222:2 245:5 250:22 252:2 252:20 253:1,3,19 257:16
perceive 105:2
percent 139:17 233:19 234:20 235:2,3 243:4 245:2,5
perception 103:11,13 103:16 137:9
perfect 102:13 208:3
perfectly 224:1
performances 69:10
performed 65:18 66:6
perimeter 46:12,22 93:18 96:10 98:2 99:6 99:13 100:9 104:12 122:21
period 24:3,19 27:18 28:21 38:17 49:8 75:18 141:20 146:11
permanent 66:5 232:17
person 59:14 141:21 159:15 190:22 206:4
personal 70:14
personally 91:14 190:22 205:1
personnel 8:9 232:16
perspective 104:1 120:22 123:19 125:22 129:14 169:6 194:1 200:18 216:3 246:1
pertaining 90:18
PETER 1:16
phase 50:3 244:2,6 246:5
phases 243:19
phasing 48:22
phenomenal 140:2
Phil 6:14
photo 232:8 253:1,3
photographs 38:3
physical 18:16 27:2 54:19 151:12 204:14 206:7
physically 172:18
picked 252:4
picnics 213:10
picture 152:5
piece 84:8 87:6 180:6 184:8
pieces 39:11
piers 167:8 168:8 169:22
pills 200:12
pink 147:11
pivot 115:22
place 11:11,13 59:10 66:7 69:14 95:20 115:19 137:18 140:11 140:12 149:2 156:16 161:4,4 189:16 208:3 212:1 217:18
placed 58:8 121:16

178:8
placemaking 227:2
placement 53:17 66:6 104:5
places 98:17 210:15 232:22 234:1
plan's 11:9 239:3 244:19
planes 161:4
planned 58:12 245:14 246:8,20
planner 2:13,15,18 11:21 135:12
planning 1:1,12 3:13 5:4 6:22 9:12 14:5 21:14 25:18 65:4 78:4 89:16 93:16 177:18 177:19 189:8,20,22 221:17 227:3,8 236:14 239:7 248:7
plans 12:15 13:2 15:2 19:4 37:3,7 48:19 111:20 165:21 166:1 166:9 170:6 177:21 178:11 185:1 231:16 241:22 249:8
plant 39:11 45:21 58:12 255:12
planter 242:7 243:1
planters 257:18
planting 119:19
plantings 41:18 174:20
plants 41:21
play 179:1
playground 122:22
playing 16:13,16
Plaza 58:6 228:8,11
please 5:6 6:4 9:4 148:3 152:9 153:5,19 156:16,18 199:13 201:16 214:11 228:16 228:19,19,20 257:2
pleased 53:6
Pledge 5:7 6:1
plenty 154:8
plot 55:16
plug 65:18
plugged 65:21 66:1
plus 208:21 254:5
poet 144:11
point 27:9 64:18,19,21 64:22 65:1,22 66:14 79:3 81:4 82:5,6 87:21 88:6 90:7 100:6 103:17,18 105:6 110:6 138:14 154:18 158:5 159:10 162:3 165:11 168:16 170:22 173:8,15 174:10 176:8 180:13 189:9 189:21 192:3,16 193:15 198:3 213:1 225:2 242:15 258:4
pointed 90:9
points 71:11 81:15 138:8 179:17 181:2 247:14 251:8
polices 238:12
policies 20:21 42:6
policy 136:9
pollinator 41:22
ponds 233:11
pools 144:21
poor 77:18
Poplar 173:8,15 174:10 176:8 189:21 213:1
popular 69:9 127:8 206:18
population 203:1 235:11 245:3,9
portable 28:13
portion 60:21 121:9 125:4,5 173:15 177:3 233:12
portions 242:15 257:22
portray 136:3
ports 66:7
pose 132:1
position 16:19
positive 16:22 38:22 62:16 85:11 93:9 158:17 240:18
possible 8:14 55:2 64:7 64:22 68:13 91:13 136:14 145:17 166:7 179:13 198:20 219:6
possibly 174:20
post-war 239:2
potential 33:8,12 36:16 36:20 37:13 49:11 51:12 112:18 114:15 114:16 124:4 126:11 139:2 140:19 171:2,7 176:2 206:20 216:7 241:20
Potomac 126:21,22 127:17 145:15 170:13 171:16 172:4 179:21 181:16 184:15,17
power 71:7 147:11 156:4 243:15
powerful 155:15 156:7
practice 62:15
praise 227:11
pre- 101:7
pre-determines 221:16
pre-dispose 222:6
precedent 86:10 90:2
precise 66:6
preclude 40:1
predates 228:1
predominant 233:11
predominate 131:20
prefer 76:13
preference 116:16
preferred 23:22 52:5,7 62:15 75:5 87:11 115:6 121:19 131:6 132:14 145:4 237:18 239:5,17 240:18 247:17
preliminary 12:15 14:2 15:2 108:10 111:19 115:7 164:5 170:6 182:3,13,21 191:15 194:22 209:15 253:12
preparation 110:4
prepared 19:1 23:9,16 37:4 50:9 105:8 109:12 129:4 219:2
preparing 54:6
prerogative 10:6
preschoolers 70:11
presence 33:21
present 1:12 2:9 82:3 86:7 91:8 212:1
presentation 17:21 53:15 56:6 78:18 91:17 94:8 96:20 97:4 97:22 109:6,8,9,15,19 110:15 133:22 139:11 163:16 167:2,5 186:1 186:15 218:7 219:11 219:13,22 230:22 231:15 233:3 249:16
PRESENTATIONS 3:16
presented 55:9 111:21 161:19 185:6,9 186:3 233:20
presents 176:11 181:10
preservation 2:17 36:4 49:16 51:3 54:2,3 79:3 167:20 171:11 221:20 243:7 248:4
preserve 47:22 54:15 130:17 143:18 238:18 247:19
preserves 238:20
preserving 24:7 38:15 91:6 239:9 248:2
President 136:22 137:4
presidential 1:14,16,21 123:16
presiding 1:11
pressure 238:16
prestige 137:19
Preston 1:10,13
pretty 79:1 86:2 89:1 90:7,13 95:2 155:10 155:19,19 158:8,15 193:7,19
prevent 42:5 67:15 153:17
preventing 62:17
previous 19:1 36:2 42:14 46:17 84:12 106:18
previously 48:21 67:18 80:18 116:15 119:6 126:10 233:20
primarily 122:20
primary 94:8,15 162:10 239:7
principle 10:19
principles 54:20 135:22
Printing 61:9
prior 240:15 247:5 249:11
priorities 21:8,17 243:21
prioritize 246:22 249:3
priority 49:4
private 59:6 173:18 190:13,15
proactive 66:20
probably 151:4 157:9 157:12 207:9 208:2 251:6
problem 66:16 87:15 136:16
problematic 199:5
problems 68:15 77:13
proceed 6:7
process 21:9,14 22:21 23:12,18 25:19 36:4 38:12 40:18 49:22 50:4 52:15 60:2 76:1 78:1 83:1,16,22 84:16 85:20 86:11,13 87:7 87:14,16,19 88:2 89:11,22 90:5,18 100:21 104:15 113:17 114:4,14 137:2 138:5 138:16,18 139:19 140:18 149:12 160:11 160:13 168:2 190:21 191:20 195:11,20 197:15 199:11 221:20 221:21 239:7 248:7
processes 56:4
processing 235:22 239:21 241:15

procession 150:17
processional 125:8
produce 242:18
productive 84:1
professional 247:20
professionals 70:12
profile 196:1 198:17
profiles 196:5
program 12:2 48:15 69:7,20 101:18 114:17,21 121:13,15 126:8,13 130:8 131:11 144:17 178:17 191:12 247:3 249:5 255:4
programmable 243:10
programmatic 23:17 49:14 53:21
programming 32:16 43:20 45:22 58:22 68:21 69:2 101:5 189:11 194:19 209:16 211:22 212:2 235:8
programs 18:20 59:8 69:14 75:14 245:8 247:9 249:13
progress 75:7 200:20 247:7 249:10
progression 151:18
project 19:13,14 30:3 33:14 40:11 48:13,17 49:10 50:2,3 52:1 56:2 60:21 61:11 68:9 76:3 77:18 81:19 82:1 83:10 99:2 112:15 117:19 119:5 135:18 159:13 164:7 166:17 167:3 168:1 170:17 171:17 172:9 175:8 175:15 177:6,9 181:22 182:9 185:7 185:10 190:1 191:4 191:14 192:9 199:20 217:11 219:3 220:11 220:14,15 241:18
project's 170:11
projected 244:12
projects 19:5,8 48:20 49:1,5,18,19 50:8 52:12 53:10 54:22 55:16 60:22 82:9,18 83:4 85:19 89:12 93:3 99:15 119:8 163:15 191:21 220:10,16 236:8 244:14,18,21 249:12
promenade 35:18 242:1 257:6,22
prominence 137:19 168:20 171:3 178:9
prominent 153:7
promise 135:13
promote 232:1
proofing 157:4
proper 105:10
properties 186:6
property 177:3 190:9 225:14 248:13
proportion 252:8
proportions 193:18 195:22
proposal 22:14 166:14 168:5 170:9 185:15
proposals 22:18
propose 18:14 46:7,15
proposed 19:12 22:11 24:10 25:12 30:9 33:16 34:10 35:8 36:6 36:15 37:4,6,11 46:5 47:19 48:15,16 50:19 107:3 116:17 117:22 119:17 121:20 125:12 128:18 129:9 130:18 133:13 145:18 171:20 178:11 179:5 221:10 222:15 224:9 244:20 246:15 248:11 249:12
proposes 31:12 47:14 244:9,22
proposing 167:6 171:8 174:14 206:1,5
propylene 62:3
prospective 179:12
protect 30:1 38:8 114:2 242:18
protected 68:6
protects 63:4
proud 94:21 103:20 162:7,17 213:19
provide 24:1 28:11,14 29:10,13 30:15 32:22 34:19 41:10 44:12 47:18 52:11 55:19 56:8 62:16 68:3 114:5 116:11 125:19 127:19 134:2 164:17 167:13 177:8 181:18 182:5 190:6 204:3 216:5 221:9 222:14 231:14 240:12 241:3
provided 18:5 29:7 36:3 36:5 114:19 136:9 174:17 175:7,14 177:15 178:21 179:9 179:11 181:5 186:5
provides 25:20 39:3 58:20 113:18 117:21 145:5 234:19 235:5 239:18
providing 45:19 75:8 128:21 182:5 185:22 248:1
prowess 115:17
proximity 121:22 132:15 141:1 145:6 169:3 171:4 237:12
public 11:8,16 22:17 24:6,19 31:6,15,18 32:4,15 38:14,17 45:17 50:5,14 53:5 56:16 58:17,19 60:1 70:7 71:6 75:8,17,22 84:19,22 97:7 107:19 113:6 114:2 126:5 141:20 146:11 156:4 176:13,19 180:6,11 180:16,19 251:2,5,10 251:16
publicly 6:8
pull 56:8 105:15 219:13
pulled 103:19
purple 257:7
purpose 23:21 130:6 132:6 233:8 237:16 237:22
purposeful 255:11
purposes 103:9 218:6
pursuant 243:4
pursuing 40:17
purview 151:13
push 138:3
pushes 59:17
put 98:16 149:4 160:17 160:22 181:21 198:7 200:16 208:3 210:15 250:15
putting 80:5
pylons 192:5

Q

quad 61:13,17 62:21,22 63:4,15 65:6,13 66:9 66:11 67:4 68:6
Quadrangle 24:11 29:16,20 30:10,21 31:13 32:11,14,21 33:5 37:22 38:8 40:4 49:5 50:19 98:8
Quadrants 4:4 163:1
quality 40:14 76:22 173:21 232:4
question 45:2 60:7,12 81:8 84:4 88:8 89:11 101:6 107:13 111:18 141:10 152:3 191:2,8 191:20 192:22 193:13 198:1 199:11,21 201:14 207:5,8 213:20 229:21 258:10
questioned 24:8 185:11
questions 12:4 15:4 52:20 97:11 109:12 109:22 111:12 134:1 156:8 186:16 214:13 219:2,14,16,20 249:17 258:15
queuing 239:18 240:7 240:12,22
quick 11:6 156:21 201:19
quickly 202:17 212:17 226:3 247:13
quiet 140:11,12,13
Quince 245:16
quite 79:2 90:3 150:15 151:20 224:10
quorum 6:6

R

radically 22:11
rail 129:6 246:3,4
railing 211:19
railway 240:13
raise 59:6
raised 25:6 60:7 81:16 154:10 185:13 190:4 192:16
ramp 29:9 104:18
ramps 32:19,22 33:16 79:15 106:11 127:10
range 27:8
rapid 137:7
rapidly 54:17
rare 61:2
rates 235:16
ratio 234:22 244:11 245:9,11
rationale 138:10
ratios 251:20 253:11
Rawlins 125:13 144:20
re-establishment 47:3 47:10
re-evaluated 133:20
re-imagined 35:19
reach 59:18
reached 59:15
reaction 139:5,12 200:3
reactive 66:19
read 148:19 214:18 254:1 258:2
readily 118:14 126:11 145:18

ready 56:3 82:12
reaffirms 8:2
real 207:5,7 246:11 257:13
realigned 16:5
realignment 241:21
reality 110:17 178:8
realized 139:8,15
reappointment 10:4
reason 34:19 256:21
reasons 102:12
reassess 246:11
recall 80:19 83:6 88:4 129:21 224:3
receipt 81:9
received 25:18 38:16 57:6 77:6 80:12 85:9 86:21 88:9 115:4 163:20
receiving 241:15
recognition 27:1 111:8
recognizable 26:15
recognize 120:21
recognized 42:19 60:5 189:16
recognizes 171:6
recognizing 188:9
recommend 28:16 39:2 47:9 95:5,15 132:4,8 170:5 205:21
recommendation 26:12 110:10 132:12 182:12
recommendations 52:18
recommended 186:9 247:11
recommending 151:15 182:2 247:15,21 248:8,10
recommends 20:22 27:1,16 32:13 33:13 35:10,21 43:10 44:7 45:11 46:20 48:12 52:4,12 121:18 122:3 124:14,21 126:14 128:9 130:13 131:19 172:3 175:3 183:12 184:21 203:17
reconfiguration 32:4 128:18
reconsider 132:9 193:12
reconsidered 133:21
record 75:3 259:15
recorded 62:9
recovered 227:19
recreational 117:13 124:17 126:12 127:2 127:9,16 129:17 130:12 133:6 243:9
red 129:10 237:19 239:16 245:19 246:3
redesign 71:14 153:9 166:15 178:21
redesigning 151:8
redevelop 238:9
redevelopment 3:14 15:4,6 174:10 179:3 225:4 238:10
redirect 38:11
reduce 58:13 210:15 243:5,15
reduced 37:13 133:17 238:17
reference 36:8
referenced 139:10
referred 122:13
referring 65:13 137:5
refine 160:6 186:6 195:22 241:18 248:22
refinement 193:18
reflecting 85:7
reflection 116:14 140:13
reflective 144:20
reflects 55:9 69:12
reforestation 242:14
reforested 250:15,19
Reform 1:17
regard 158:21
regarding 36:6 50:17 60:8 104:12 119:8 133:1,9,15 138:8 140:20 177:5 182:4 182:20 183:4,15 184:2 186:8 216:5 221:10 222:15 239:11 248:4,18
regardless 212:5
Region 143:7
regional 162:15
Register 21:5 232:22 234:1
REGISTERED 72:12 142:9
regular 58:19 85:19 234:14 247:3 249:6
reinforce 118:6 180:5
reinforced 63:7 67:19
reinforces 158:10
reinforcing 63:11 67:20
reiterate 85:2 91:21 155:22 190:20
related 28:8 44:15 45:13 48:10 113:19 124:22 132:16 162:3 204:6 209:11,17 219:9 247:8 249:10 249:13
relates 152:10 194:11 194:11 195:3 203:11 203:16 209:16 211:13 212:18
relation 196:2
relationship 36:10 48:1 48:7 74:18 120:10 124:1 127:22 144:3 152:17 178:13 180:1 180:5 194:10
relationships 174:4
relative 109:3 140:11 140:13
relatively 119:9 126:2
released 22:2 51:13
relevance 54:16 158:11
relevant 56:4 90:7 113:22 124:3
relocated 28:1 29:6 34:15 50:20 79:14 106:10
relocating 57:14
relocation 28:17 35:11 35:21 40:5
remain 47:21 92:19 94:19 109:20 130:10 136:7 211:21 212:9
remaining 51:8 233:3 235:3 244:13 245:4
remains 92:18
remarkable 150:16 193:7
remarks 72:5 135:14
remediation 65:7
remember 135:10 137:14 195:6 214:6 231:13
reminded 227:16
reminder 19:14 113:5
reminds 171:10 225:2
reminiscent 131:18 159:6
removal 34:5 102:16
removals 68:4
removed 31:8 67:11 110:14 123:19 152:7 152:8
removing 22:12 43:11
rendering 101:14,21 170:18 198:16
renderings 19:11 78:21 105:4 175:7 179:13 215:6
renewal 55:4
renovated 236:19
renovation 61:8 244:2
renovations 235:10
rent 70:2
reopen 58:18 59:6
repair 60:20
repaired 65:6
repairs 66:4,5,6 68:13
repeat 79:12
repeating 238:4
replace 24:8 60:9 77:9 168:9 244:9
replaced 31:8
replacement 14:3,6 42:5
replacing 39:17,21
replant 41:17
report 3:2,5 6:2,9 11:2 11:4 12:9 60:11 80:7 138:8 143:9 147:8 186:5 196:11 214:14 223:17 247:7 249:10
representation 249:17
representative 10:12 252:1
representatives 1:17 85:18 167:19 186:16
represented 115:10
representing 69:8
represents 68:2 172:18
Republic 157:19
request 41:8,16 42:4 48:13 122:4 174:12 177:7 208:13 221:8 222:14
requested 42:15 47:18 48:22 113:1 171:15 185:16
requesting 248:21 249:2,9
requests 41:19 132:18 176:15 180:16 183:9 183:19,21 184:10,18 185:1,3 222:21 248:20
require 17:15,16 19:8 30:4 45:13 47:7 124:16 130:9,16 133:5 178:16
required 70:20 85:19 90:3
requirements 18:16 175:21 185:5 250:21
requires 31:17 128:5 215:1,8 216:3
research 28:8 69:13 203:9 233:7 234:3 235:8 236:15,16 237:20 239:2 244:7

248:1
researchers 245:6 251:22 252:7
reserve 113:12 141:2,6
residential 165:10 179:4 220:20 221:12 221:15,18 223:14 232:12
residents 42:10 172:13 176:17 179:7 183:21 184:7
resistance 65:2
resolutions 136:18
resolve 68:15
resounding 137:8
resources 23:14 49:12 114:3 143:7
respect 8:14 59:20 77:8 110:16 153:16 180:6 184:9
respected 138:17
respectfully 162:19
respecting 55:12 226:18
respects 258:20
respond 35:2 42:10 51:1,5 84:3,6 86:5 194:2
responded 22:17 183:2 185:22
responding 93:14 194:3
responds 88:12
response 9:16 17:9 19:1 36:2 39:13 48:9 60:11 66:19 85:3 86:22 109:21 118:1 161:22 167:10 168:4 172:14 181:18 216:21 217:9 229:19 230:9 259:9
responsibilities 54:14
responsibility 160:21
responsible 39:16
responsive 81:15 85:9 86:21 87:9 92:9
responsiveness 55:5
rest 29:8 86:13 112:3 127:12 199:19 210:10
restoration 27:17 28:20 29:7 43:5,11,21 45:16 46:21 47:3 49:3 61:10
restorative 55:19
restore 46:7 51:19 56:15
restored 27:21 29:2 115:17
restoring 20:13 116:2
restriction 194:11
result 70:1 86:8
resulting 23:10 244:10
results 87:2 245:8
resume 146:13 208:9
retail 179:4 225:8
retain 39:22 41:5
retained 25:10,12
retaining 38:17 40:9
retention 24:21
retired 11:21 143:5
retirees 70:12
retirement 12:3
return 23:19 27:14 43:13 52:3 56:16 86:16,17 87:21 90:15 115:6 136:1 160:5 208:13
returned 113:4
returning 118:1
reuse 41:9,12
reverse 165:13
review 18:13 19:9 22:21 23:21 36:4 42:15 46:12 47:17 50:11,18 52:3 79:7 83:4 86:13 88:12 112:20 113:4 114:7 144:22 164:7 167:15,18 182:10 191:22 193:11 215:3 215:10 226:1 231:17 247:8 249:11
reviewed 19:5 48:19 50:13 80:13,16 82:19 83:9 89:12 196:11
reviews 50:12
revise 116:8
revised 88:12 90:11 107:18 169:21 208:1
revision 53:18 197:22
revisions 86:7 87:3
revitalization 43:16 56:10
revitalize 56:19
Revord 72:6,11 74:1,3 75:17
RFK 3:14 15:3,6 16:13 16:15
Rhodes 1:18 111:15 161:10,13 162:2
Richard 60:3,12
rid 253:17
right-hand 169:8
right-of-way 210:10
rightfully 137:19
rigid 62:2,5
rigueur 154:19
Ripley 34:5,10 57:4 58:16 60:9 61:16 68:22 69:16 94:18
rise 90:17
risk 193:9
risky 71:8
river 117:18 126:22 127:21 130:1 131:3 143:22 164:14 165:17 169:14,18 172:5,20 176:22 177:4 178:6 182:19 185:17 192:6 221:6
river's 168:21
riverfront 185:19
Rivers 171:17
riverwalk 190:8,11
road 129:6 133:10 234:18 240:3 241:17 245:16,20
roadmap 55:14
roadway 127:15 181:8 185:2
roadways 232:10
Robert 72:2
robust 186:9 257:13
Rock 3:13 126:22 127:8 127:11,17
Roe 135:11
role 50:7 176:20
roles 28:7
roof 24:9 30:13 31:7 37:21,22 60:9 61:19 61:21,22 62:22 63:15 65:14 66:11 67:20 77:9 242:6
roofing 63:21 67:12 68:1,14
roofs 65:6 147:10
room 1:9 157:17
rooms 29:8 45:14 69:19 121:6 125:7,10
Roosevelt 127:4
rooted 138:12
Rose 57:4
rose-colored 236:18
roughed 86:2
routes 245:20
rows 119:17 144:21
rubberized 61:22 64:10 64:15
run 84:16 219:11 250:5 253:22
running 211:11 250:4
runoff 243:15
rust 63:12
rustic 59:7

S

S 61:16
Sackler 29:15 30:16 33:22 57:16 61:15
sacred 115:1 116:13 121:14 124:12 125:20 129:7 130:4,9 133:17
sacrifice 136:6 162:13
sad 110:14
safe 214:9
safely 18:19
safety 213:20 214:10
sample 251:14
sandwich 67:10
satellite 232:8
satisfy 89:18
saturate 63:22
save 41:17 167:5 243:16
saw 196:19 199:4 208:17
saying 147:11 221:14
says 56:12 106:4 159:20 207:22 223:3 223:7
scale 22:6 33:15 36:18 39:6,8 44:5,9 59:1 79:15 106:11 132:10 157:11 234:7
scales 180:19 184:12
scanned 80:4
scared 120:5 133:5,14
scary 228:12
scheme 22:3 51:14 96:1 120:3,8,16,19 121:1,3,5 125:6,14,17 129:13 152:11,14
schemes 117:4 120:3 121:11 122:5 125:3 149:22 152:10,12,13
Schuyler 2:16 12:6,8
science 232:2
scientists 254:14
scope 221:3
scoping 190:1
scores 70:16
screen 20:3 21:22 23:6 113:19 120:1 123:7 123:12 127:7 128:4 157:1
sculptural 120:6 121:2 125:11
sculpture 46:6 47:5,12 47:15,20 48:9,14 49:6
sculptures 48:4
seasonal 39:16
second 8:1 9:8,9 11:13 16:8 55:5 103:11 107:10,11 111:16

122:17 125:14 161:16 170:12 171:13 215:15 216:1,2,15 217:3 222:21 225:2 229:13 230:3 245:19 259:3
seconded 16:10,12 17:3 107:2,13,20 111:18 161:18 215:17 216:17 217:5 229:4 229:15 230:5 259:5
Secondly 31:21 116:3
Secretary 2:14 81:12 85:5 135:13,15 138:16 155:16 160:5 162:8
section 23:12,18 49:15 52:14 53:22 56:4 57:19 105:13 214:22
sections 242:6
sector 173:18
secure 43:21 69:18 97:2,14
security 20:17 97:6 98:2,19 99:1,7,13 100:12 104:12 232:4 235:22 239:13 240:16 241:11 250:21 251:12
sediment 243:6
seeing 84:2 95:22 104:1 135:9 192:18 258:6,19
seek 10:7 48:9 58:9 110:11
seeking 28:15 140:5 182:13
seeks 20:10 30:20 43:4 46:9
seen 39:4 44:20 77:1 115:16 116:1 118:2 165:4 179:2 196:12 196:17 201:1 232:9 255:20
seep 63:16,22
seeping 67:17
seismic 30:1
selecting 239:16
selection 23:22 112:9 113:14,20 114:6,9,12 116:9 138:5,16,19 145:12 239:4
selections 222:16
send 160:1
senior 2:12 92:2
sense 149:7 203:6 206:11 207:6
Sensing 107:20
sensitive 37:14 89:2 175:18 242:13
sensitivity 33:11 224:21
sent 24:4 88:9
sentiment 110:22
separate 83:18,19 158:18 241:1,3,10
separated 166:17 169:7 209:22 233:5
separating 240:11
separation 202:16 204:7,14 206:8 210:1 240:20
sequence 173:3
sequences 172:12
sequencing 244:17
series 40:22 120:17,21 121:6 125:6,10 129:5 155:8 243:18 244:6
serious 70:22 228:16 255:10
seriously 54:13
serve 29:18 32:2 34:22 51:1 70:11
served 116:6
serves 141:14 176:20 180:15 232:5
service 3:21 10:17 47:8 54:1 76:13,20 112:16 115:5,13,15 116:7 118:1 128:15 143:6 162:12,20 173:9 235:4
services 1:22 20:16,19 25:7 30:9 31:22 51:21 61:13
session 1:5 17:11 137:1
set 10:19 20:21 42:6 49:22 50:3 74:6 250:21
setbacks 37:5 121:16
setting 22:10 33:12,17 38:21 39:4 42:2 46:3 58:9 79:16 86:10 90:2 106:12 117:14 122:9 123:5 124:6,19 143:16 167:12 173:12 176:8 183:17 205:15 234:6 238:18 241:19 249:1
settings 202:17
settling 163:13
seven 59:11 235:3
shade 42:1 122:21
Shady 246:3,7
Shakespeare 61:3,3
shame 251:17 255:3
share 86:9 92:3 249:4
shared 209:21 247:2
shared-use 212:5
sharing 207:12
Shaw 1:19 92:7 135:1,2 146:13 147:1 148:15 153:3 189:5,6 190:20 191:3 213:19 215:21 217:3 219:18,19 225:21 230:3
Shaw's 152:21 227:15
shed 165:4 224:15
sheds 164:12
sheer 67:7
sheet 62:5
sheltered 239:19 240:8 240:13,21
Shield 3:22 4:12,19 112:7,10,19 115:10 116:1 134:4 135:18 138:4 141:12 150:19
shiny 199:7
shipments 241:7
shipping 241:14
short 76:7,7 143:12,12 245:11
short-term 59:7 235:3
shorter 168:19
shot 102:13
show 36:9 37:4,7 45:5 47:20 48:3 70:22 78:19,22 87:14 106:5 117:4 121:12 126:7 135:8 149:22 174:3 180:19 184:10 194:8 194:9,9,10,17,18 195:3,9 210:14 235:14
showed 23:2 24:13 175:9
showing 91:6 96:7 99:3 121:1 129:14 174:18 209:15 213:10
shown 22:4 34:6 49:8 116:22 123:7,12 129:15 152:5 167:7 179:11 231:22 233:2 236:16,18,20 237:19 239:16,22 245:16,19 246:6,9
shows 35:8,17 36:17 78:15 80:10 101:1,13 101:22 105:3 106:3 128:4 130:19 231:19 233:10 237:1 242:11 242:22 243:9,18 244:2,6
SHPO 183:10
side 19:15 46:16 62:16 67:14 74:12,13 89:16 89:17 110:13 128:12 165:9,11,16 166:11 169:8,11 172:21 174:7 175:11 179:14 181:13 188:18 190:9 205:16,17 210:17 212:6 213:8 214:8,9 222:10,11 223:12 225:4,9 226:12 232:11 233:6 240:2 245:16 251:15 253:2
sides 169:18 172:16 181:10 182:18 205:8 205:11 206:21 212:6 225:22
sidewalk 118:15,22 181:5,17
sidewalks 242:4 243:11 257:14
sign 226:1
signage 177:6,8 185:1
signalized 118:15 213:4,15 258:11
signatories 54:1
signature 106:5
signed 75:19 105:16 106:4 141:21
significance 27:18 28:21
significant 17:14 21:19 22:14 23:14 51:16 54:10 58:5 59:2 91:11 91:20 133:11 197:11 230:18 248:12 257:20
significantly 182:2 189:10
signs 70:22 185:3
similar 114:16 132:7 149:14,17
simple 78:19
simplicity 154:2
simply 70:17
sincerely 138:20
sing 189:13
single 200:18 251:14
sir 214:12
sit 9:19 94:4 98:17,18 103:20 137:22 151:14 220:7
site's 118:17 242:20
sites 112:18,22 114:15 114:22 116:20,22 117:20 123:22 138:22 150:9 157:6
siting 119:12
sits 60:10 100:3
sitting 85:18 153:3

179:1 203:7 211:4
situated 232:11,13
situating 113:21
situation 154:10
six 168:11 203:18 234:13 236:12
size 33:15 36:6,18 37:9 37:13 116:19 173:1 180:10 181:12
sizing 53:17
skip 219:22
skylights 29:9 32:2,19 40:6 96:8,11,14
skyline 185:20
slab 61:22 62:1
sleep 193:5
slide 93:20 109:21 164:20 165:9 175:11 179:11 201:16 231:22 242:11 252:10
slides 168:15 174:17 233:4 236:9 247:13
slightly 167:8
small 46:16 69:15 71:3 125:7,10
smaller 22:6 34:15 36:18
smart 111:5,11
Smithsonian 3:17,19 17:22 18:4,11,14 19:21 20:19 21:3,16 21:20 22:1,22 23:11 24:18 25:4 26:13,16 26:18,20 27:3 28:8 29:13,22 30:20 32:18 33:15,19 34:14 35:12 36:4 38:4 39:15 40:2 40:8,13,16 41:4,8,16 43:4 44:2,8 47:18 48:8 49:2,12 51:9 52:21 53:8 54:8 55:20 56:11,12 57:7 68:21 69:6,7,9,13 70:3,6,14 71:12,13 74:7,18 75:5 75:10 76:10,19 81:7 83:14 86:12 87:19 90:22 91:22 92:8 93:13 95:5 97:14 99:9 107:16 110:9 148:21
Smithsonian's 18:19 25:16 42:12 51:11 52:5 72:1 81:4
smooth 8:13
smoothly 78:10
sober 138:20
soccer 213:11
society 137:6
softball 33:7
soften 222:3
solar 243:15 248:15
sold 77:10
solely 139:12
solution 66:20 77:19
solve 136:15
somebody 9:22 128:7 157:12
somewhat 104:7 114:11 116:19 181:10
song 250:14
soon 164:22 178:4 181:3 188:6
sophisticated 78:6,22
sorry 16:10 82:17 96:1 100:1 156:11 191:11 222:19,20 227:15 255:19
sort 93:17 97:13 100:8 100:16 101:7 110:11 147:7,19 148:2,9 154:2 158:18 205:9 206:7,10,11 210:6 213:21 224:15 226:13 226:17
sought 57:6 86:19
sound 63:14
sounds 157:2 250:13
source 66:8
sources 66:9
south 3:18 4:6 18:1,4 18:12 19:15,17 20:7 20:11 25:10 27:4 32:3 34:17,21 35:4,17 38:20 39:5,7 40:10 42:8 52:22 53:8,16 54:10 58:4 71:14 74:7 74:12,15 75:11 91:18 92:11 117:11 119:18 120:16 123:21 145:11 163:4,7 164:4,11 165:5,14,19 166:4,19 171:4 172:8 173:4 178:9 180:1 181:4 182:7 184:9,16 232:13 233:7,13 237:6,8 251:15 256:10
southbound 165:12
southeast 4:3 163:1 173:19 233:15
southern 141:6
southwest 4:3 27:10 34:21 35:14 53:17 57:18 72:6 74:4,8,10 74:11,12,17,22 75:7 75:12 117:6 163:1
space 3:19 6:20 11:9 18:15 22:5,19 28:19 31:19 42:22 44:9,12 47:16 48:16 54:9 58:22 63:18 70:2,10 75:8 78:8 91:11 92:1 93:19 94:7 95:8 97:3 97:7,14 98:11,15 99:12 100:17 102:7 103:19 108:8,13,14 114:2 115:2 116:14 120:5 121:14 124:12 124:16 125:15,20 126:17 129:7,18 130:4,9,16,20 132:17 133:4,5,14,18 148:5 156:3 157:19 166:3 176:2,14 178:19 179:6 180:16 184:5,7 210:12,21 228:12,19 232:15 235:11 236:15 236:19 237:15,20,21 238:2 239:19 240:7 240:12,22 241:16 244:5 247:19 251:3 251:11 253:5,15,18 257:21
spaces 28:2 31:6,9,15 32:2,4 43:15 44:5 45:8 61:6 62:8 63:17 69:21 70:3,15,19 96:10 125:19 148:6 156:4 166:10 173:3 178:22 180:4 234:19 235:1 236:16,18 237:3 242:9 243:10 252:13,14,16,17 253:9
span 68:12
spanning 194:13
spans 167:8
spatial 44:22
speak 71:15 89:10 94:11
speakers 72:12 135:5 142:9
speaking 163:11
special 171:15 177:20
Specialist 2:17
specialized 234:8 239:1
specialty 60:18 233:7
specific 19:12 30:2 52:1 55:16 80:20 81:15,21 83:4 86:19 120:18 172:14 247:2
specifically 27:18 65:18 221:7
specificity 101:4
specimens 39:17
speech 250:5
speed 161:3 206:14 254:1
spend 6:12
spending 95:7 98:9 153:9
spent 11:22 94:22 109:2,18
spine 237:5,6 238:3
spirit 85:12 91:6
spite 16:20
sponsor 115:5
sponsor's 121:15
sports 178:3
spread 237:21
spring 23:20 168:8
square 54:9 61:18 232:15 235:9
St 170:21
stack 62:22,22
Stacy 11:21,22 12:2
stadium 15:3 165:8 178:5 181:1,3 185:19
staff 2:9 20:22 27:1,16 28:16 32:13 33:9,13 35:10,20 38:19 39:2 40:8 41:7,15 42:3 43:10 44:7 45:11 46:20 47:9 48:12 50:13 51:10,14 52:4 52:12,15 59:22 71:3,6 75:21 88:13 99:10 105:20 114:22 117:21 121:18 122:3 124:3 124:14 126:14 127:13 128:9 130:3,13 131:19 132:3 138:2,8 143:9 147:8 159:19 167:4 168:3 169:20 170:8 171:9,18 172:3 174:11 175:3,18 176:1,7,15 177:7,22 178:10 179:5 180:9 180:16 181:6,15,20 183:9 184:21 186:5 186:12 189:3 194:4,5 194:7 195:8,18,20 209:1 238:19 241:13 246:21
staff's 26:12 76:19 123:18 125:22
stage 19:13 30:3 40:12 53:20 84:14 86:17 114:18 177:7 254:11
stair 49:5
stairs 29:2 33:16
stairway 104:18,21
stakeholder 49:13

stakeholders 21:20 25:3
stand 5:6 99:21
standalone 44:16
standards 4:16 207:6 230:14,20 231:11 232:3,5 236:5 242:13 243:5
stands 80:9 233:14
Star 160:19
start 77:18,19 95:21 99:10 220:6 246:13
started 76:12 77:19 78:2 161:2 192:1
starting 26:12 236:10
state 54:3 56:15 59:7 118:10 123:3 124:1 162:15 192:18 203:14 236:5 243:5 248:9
stated 167:9
statement 23:9 54:7 65:12
STATEMENTS 73:9 146:15
STATEMETNS 187:9
states 3:10,21 4:15 113:7 171:6 173:6 179:16 230:13 231:9 232:7
static 155:21
station 65:8 246:3,4
stay 206:13 212:4 252:2
stead 227:13
steady 235:15
steel 63:11 168:7
steer 149:10
step 53:7 85:17
steps 41:5 51:10 78:1
stewardship 54:14
Stone 144:18
stood 135:21
stop 66:4,4 67:8 242:3 257:17
stopping 66:20
store 27:22 29:8 41:17
stories 70:21
Storm 3:22 4:12,18 112:7,10,17,19 113:7 115:10 116:1 118:2 134:4 135:7,18 136:2 137:8 138:4 141:12 149:5 160:18
Storm/Desert 150:19
stormwater 174:5 175:13,14,17,21 185:5 242:12,21 243:15 248:14
story 28:10 41:13 92:14 125:7 147:4
straight 109:8
straight-line 235:15
straight-up 252:6
strategic 56:9 59:17 92:4
strategies 23:4 93:4 99:6 122:10 246:16
strategy 119:13 152:19
Stratton 163:19
Stream 3:13
streamed 6:5
streams 233:13
street 1:10 4:6,7 19:16 19:16 34:18 35:7,18 74:11,13,14 94:14 118:15 122:19,20 128:13 144:9 152:13 163:3,4,7 164:4,12 165:5,14,19 166:4,19 171:4 172:9 173:5 179:20 181:4 182:7 184:16 225:3,10 226:8,12,12 227:20 241:19 257:16
streets 127:2,10
streetscape 3:9 4:12 12:16 35:20 217:20 218:1 257:13
strengthen 184:19
strengthened 174:11 184:1
stretching 74:11
strictly 60:19
striking 136:14
stripe 204:13
strive 55:11
stroller 211:10
strong 24:6 38:14 71:13 74:17 121:21 132:15 139:9 145:7 170:3 182:22 184:17 190:14
strongest 117:22
strongly 22:17 140:14 155:19
struck 220:8 254:5
structural 61:21 196:8
structure 43:1,16 44:22 63:6,8,13,17 65:19 143:15 210:9
structures 232:14
students 124:10
studies 30:4,5 41:3 117:1 121:12 131:9 165:21 178:11 235:13
study 129:4 139:1,8,15 139:20 202:12 220:19
studying 196:4
stuff 95:2 102:9 148:13 220:7 251:4 254:16 255:12
stumbled 139:19
Stump 135:6,10 137:21 141:19 143:2
style 42:19
sub- 166:20
sub-basement 22:15
subgrade 61:14
subject 86:12 225:22
submission 47:20 48:2 71:22
submissions 48:14
submit 215:2,9 231:16 247:7 249:10
submitted 14:4 18:11 112:16 143:8 164:3 166:14 182:9 189:9 231:10
submitting 249:11
Subsequently 22:1
substance 100:22 219:17
substantial 47:14 191:17
substantially 22:6 26:5 178:14
substantive 81:6 193:20
substrate 61:19 67:21
suburbs 70:4
subway 227:20
success 115:16 116:5 137:8 154:1
successful 42:2 130:15 184:18 248:1
successor 8:10
sucked 227:21
suffer 71:4
sufficient 31:6 181:18
suggest 132:3 151:3,4 223:7
suggested 123:15
suggesting 174:15
suggestion 90:19
suggestions 55:8 80:22 81:1
suggests 41:7,15 42:3
suitability 113:3
Suite 1:9
suited 126:18
Suitland 4:5 163:2 164:13,15 166:22 172:11 176:9 177:2
sum 42:8
summarize 163:16
summarizes 235:18
summary 56:9 80:10 166:1
summer 23:20 69:10 70:16 231:18
super 170:20 209:19
support 7:1 21:1 24:6 27:17 28:18 32:13 33:8,9 38:15 41:21 42:11 45:21 46:21 47:10 52:5,13 71:13 71:21 74:6 106:2 121:19 131:1 132:13 136:17 143:9 159:19 177:14 233:6 247:16 248:8
supported 28:13 51:15 167:8
supporter 227:1
supporting 32:6 43:10
supportive 169:20 171:9,18 186:12 224:1
supports 51:10 179:5 184:6 241:13
supposed 80:1 148:17
Supreme 166:7
surface 63:2 64:4 67:4 168:9,18,21 238:9,11 244:8
surfaces 206:9
surgeon 256:2,3
surgery 256:3
surmise 141:8
surplus 252:13,15
surrounded 123:5 125:16 173:7
surrounding 70:4 124:9 125:21 126:6 130:11 178:14,18 184:5 185:10 223:8 257:19
surroundings 113:21 226:19
surrounds 46:12
Susan 6:14
sustainability 20:18 236:3 242:20 243:14 248:3,7,9
sustainable 42:2 236:1
sustained 40:22
SW 35:19
sweeping 130:1 169:13
swoop 101:16
symbolic 27:2 150:13 165:20 182:16
symbolized 129:10
sympathetic 198:15
syndrome 137:6
synopsis 53:12

system 63:3,21 65:9 66:22 68:15 210:7 242:22 248:15
systems 45:20 172:7 174:4,6

T

tablets 28:13 120:21 121:2
taken 38:4 51:11 55:7
takes 25:17 32:7 212:1
talk 156:22 158:1
talked 92:13 154:18 197:20 199:11 257:18
talking 68:7 78:7,12 94:22 95:8 98:10 131:8 157:4 193:21 220:9 256:14
tall 55:13 95:1,2 97:9 126:3 129:8
team 53:14 138:15 139:4,17 140:5 147:3 148:9 186:6 209:19
technical 107:3
technologies 68:8
technology 4:17 28:14 92:21 93:5 230:14,20 231:11 232:3
teens 70:12
tell 41:13 53:13 79:21 92:14 96:2 97:12 125:7 140:1 199:13 202:3
telling 28:10
temporarily 16:5
temporary 44:15 66:3
ten 160:16,19 169:17 202:13 204:4 210:8
tend 206:13,13
tens 70:7
term 8:5
terminate 129:9
terminates 117:16
terminus 129:22 143:16 166:6
terms 89:11 105:2 114:4 118:11 122:14 126:16 129:3 133:3 133:14 154:1 198:16 234:12
Terry 163:19
testimony 65:3 77:6
testing 100:11
thank 6:3 9:17 10:1,16 10:22 11:1,5 12:8 18:9 52:21 53:3,11 60:15,16 68:17,18 69:4 71:14,16 72:8 75:15 76:1,2,8 82:14 85:13 90:6,22 92:2,6 92:8 93:12 100:17 108:2,4,6 110:2,7,8 111:2,10 112:1,6,15 134:2 135:2 137:20 138:12 141:17,18 143:1 145:20,22 147:1,2 148:14,15 150:5,6 159:11 162:1 162:21 188:1 189:6 192:12 200:7 201:11 201:13 208:10 214:11 214:12 217:10,17,21 226:21 228:4,5,6 230:10,12 231:3 249:15,18 250:1 255:18 256:5 258:14 258:17,18 259:12
thanked 162:19
thanking 75:21 135:16 162:11
thanks 53:1 59:21 74:1 75:16 189:3,4 191:19 209:19
thematic 121:21 126:10 132:15 139:9 145:7
Thematically 123:18 127:19
theme 133:8 155:17 156:6
Theodore 127:4
things 6:10 55:21 76:8 79:6 92:21 93:6 96:4 97:9 102:12,15 147:17 191:1 192:2 193:19 195:14 197:14 199:7 201:2,4 208:8 211:14 212:3 220:12 226:11 251:13,21 253:16
think's 210:13
thinks 221:17 253:13
third 3:4 8:21 55:11 223:2
Thomas 1:16 9:1
thorough 139:1 140:17
thought 25:2 77:1 88:16 92:9 112:12 114:4 149:9 163:21 188:11 202:11 210:14 225:12
thoughtful 150:10 255:11
thoughts 153:19
thousand 253:8
thousands 70:8
three 21:5 54:19 55:15 70:21 101:2 112:21 115:21 116:22 120:2 121:11 122:5 123:2 150:9 152:11,14 160:19 169:22,22 173:1 180:10 207:20 208:1 214:22 222:20 233:5 238:6 239:12 240:19 243:19 244:6 248:20 250:6
three-acre 166:21
three-quarters 62:12
three-story 30:11
thriving 75:1
through-put 102:15
throw 158:2 253:9
Thursday 1:7 11:13
tie 237:4
tied 121:8
tiled 251:13
time-honored 135:21
timely 8:10 10:4
times 85:22 87:10 145:7 162:5 180:3 188:20 202:20
tip 141:6
today 18:22 22:8,13 29:16 31:3,4 33:7 39:18 55:9 68:9 74:3 78:11 79:22 80:3,7,13 94:3,4 96:15,20 97:10 112:11 113:4 115:3 117:12,14 131:6 137:16 155:19 200:10 247:12 258:11,18
today's 6:4,16 17:18 23:21 207:6
told 57:22 197:9
Tom 9:6 10:2,2
ton 253:4
top 102:2 250:6
topic 207:17
topographic 183:6
topography 174:6
topologies 148:8
topology 185:14
total 192:20 214:3 234:13,20 235:2 244:10 245:3
totally 138:7 153:1
totals 235:1
tour 33:2
tourist 103:5
town 153:5
traditional 59:9 238:7
traffic 127:15 129:16 133:11 144:6 174:14 203:22 204:20 234:18 239:14 240:8,11,14 240:15,21,21 241:4,8 241:9,16
trail 118:22 127:8,9 129:17 130:12 169:18 210:7,8 245:15
trails 243:9
train 17:20 71:20 161:1 161:2 254:3
trajectory 93:10
transfer 241:5
transferred 105:18 173:16
transformed 137:3
transit 242:2 245:18 246:6
transition 8:8,14 165:17
transparency 54:21
transparent 104:8
transportation 4:3 123:9 163:1 164:3 170:2 191:13 203:15 215:2 216:4 246:20 247:7 248:19 249:10
travel 64:17 67:6 151:10 165:12 168:11 169:6 211:2 227:12 245:7 246:16,18 247:1,4,9,9 249:3,6 249:13,14
traveling 64:6
travels 64:3 65:21
treated 176:4
treating 243:3
treatment 137:9
tree 42:5,6 233:13
trees 41:17 100:8 119:17 122:21 125:12 144:21 152:5,7 180:3
tremendous 179:3
tremendously 70:9 154:5
trend 247:10 249:14
trends 235:13
tried 86:21
trio 189:14
trip 7:4 250:8
triple 168:7
triple- 168:10
Triumph 213:12
troubled 188:5
troubling 82:15
Trowbridge 97:5 108:4
truck 241:4,7,14
trucks 241:5
true 9:21 160:13 207:10
truly 140:16

trust 53:13 104:14 234:2
try 76:6 83:21 99:14 159:3,9 160:7,7 212:16 213:13 252:18
trying 25:6 40:2 78:5 94:1 96:3 97:1 98:5 100:17 102:14 197:18 202:7 218:6
tunnel 47:4 65:15,16,16 66:4 119:5
tunnels 65:20
turn 63:11 70:16 93:19 146:13
turned 192:4
tweak 188:22
twice 185:7
two 11:6,7 30:17,18 44:1 51:20 55:15 57:15 67:10 71:21 79:18 98:12 106:14 123:3 125:3 137:7 140:21 147:17 152:11 152:12,13 162:14,17 163:14 166:21 168:7 178:3 179:18 183:16 184:14 204:2,7,18 205:16,17,18 211:3,4 211:8 212:15 214:15 233:11,14 238:2 240:10 244:2 245:14 247:12 251:10 256:16 256:22 257:5
two-sided 202:3
two-way 169:16
twofold 170:10
type 45:9 204:10 233:6 257:19
types 45:7
typical 62:15
typically 65:1
typology 155:8

U

U.S 1:17 61:10 115:17 118:9 124:2 164:11 166:7 170:12 173:5 176:10,21 178:10,13 180:2,14 183:5 184:9 184:14 232:1
ultimate 136:6
ultimately 57:14 59:2 78:4 83:4 167:17 211:18 239:15
unacceptable 63:20
unanimous 108:3 216:22
uncomfortable 188:16 197:15
uncontrolled 128:6
unconventional 68:2
underground 30:11 65:8 69:15 70:22 77:12 102:7
underlying 86:19
underneath 213:22
underscore 158:19
understand 21:14 48:22 67:3 76:15 77:11 78:13,16 82:2 83:3 86:19 87:5 94:1 96:3 97:1 98:6 102:5 103:7 110:16 147:4 154:21 172:1 177:9 179:9 185:15 193:17 195:20 199:20 202:12 213:5 218:8 221:1 225:13
understanding 97:13 226:18 257:11
understands 176:1 181:6
understood 138:19
undertaken 43:17
undertakings 49:18
underutilized 251:8
underwalk 190:7
underway 65:8
undesirable 63:18 79:18 106:13
unencumbered 126:3
unfortunately 177:4 227:12
uninviting 225:7
unique 115:18 248:6 251:21
United 3:10,21 4:15 136:17 178:4 181:3 230:13 231:9 232:7
units 165:10 220:20
unity 155:18
University 61:5
unknown 66:10 209:13
unscripted 59:12
unwelcome 102:21
unwind 78:5
upcoming 9:7
update 3:6 11:8 12:6,7 114:6
updated 36:21 114:14
upgraded 45:20
upper 179:15
urban 2:12,15,18 11:21 92:10 123:4 124:6,19 173:13 178:19 179:17 180:7 184:5 226:4
usage 258:9
use 18:18 34:16 42:16 43:3,14 44:13 45:9,17 52:13 55:22 56:16 78:8 80:21 81:16 114:3 122:14 125:3 130:3 131:15 178:19 179:5 181:13 184:6 204:1 209:22 234:10 234:14 237:19 241:10 246:17 252:19
user 32:5
uses 44:19 45:13 120:8 120:20 123:6 124:8 124:10,18 125:5 126:12 127:2,16 133:6 178:18 179:4 180:7 184:5 233:6,8
usually 255:4
utility 58:14
utilized 49:17
utilizes 125:15 129:5

V

V 168:7
valid 162:6
Valley 3:13
valor 162:12
value 222:4
variation 250:14
varies 116:19
variety 41:20 123:5,8 124:8 254:16
various 33:6 38:21 50:13 51:22 184:12
varying 125:11 181:15
vault 39:10
vegan 254:21
vehicle 207:14 235:4 239:20 240:9 246:18
vehicles 127:18 168:12 239:19 241:6 252:12
venues 178:3
Vernon 217:18 222:10
version 105:16 107:18 107:18 198:19
versus 152:11 256:9
vertical 29:1 122:12 126:1 129:8,15 131:2
vestibules 3:20 108:11 111:20
veterans 117:9 118:4 120:11 121:22 128:2 128:11 137:10 144:3 145:9 162:11,18
viable 56:20 68:3
vibrancy 226:10
vibrant 178:15
vibration 242:19
Vice 3:3 8:12,18,20 9:2 9:7,12 10:9 89:9
victory 137:15
video 135:9 155:16
Vietnam 115:20 117:9 118:3,4 120:11 121:21 128:2,11 137:5 144:3 145:9 150:15,18 151:16,19 153:22 162:6,10,11
Vietnam-era 162:18
view 34:9,10,11 35:5,8 35:16 36:12,19,20,21 39:3 79:3 102:4 103:2 103:4 120:15 125:9 125:18 164:12 165:4 170:9,21 198:2,3 224:15 233:1
viewer 48:7
viewing 48:4
views 34:6 37:17 117:14 119:14 126:4 127:20 130:1,4 131:18 143:20,22 149:20 169:13 170:11 170:14,18 172:7 176:10 183:5,18 185:16 186:2 221:5,5
viewshed 91:17 103:9 129:10
viewsheds 220:18
vignettes 40:22
Virginia 61:5
visibility 20:15 57:17 98:11 126:5 140:3,7
visible 131:3 140:4
vision 74:6 99:12 189:9
visit 140:10 152:1 153:5 231:2
visitability 140:7,8
visited 34:1 154:6
visiting 241:9 251:22 252:6
visitor 18:18 20:16 26:10,21 27:5,13 28:12,18,22 29:20 30:9,22 31:22 32:17 33:8 40:3 44:19 45:12 51:21 116:13 117:9 127:14 234:22 235:21 239:11,21 241:15
visitor's 45:3,9 145:10
visitors 26:17 28:4,15 32:6 33:11,20 39:1 42:3,10 93:18 98:12 118:5 124:5 141:16 154:5 172:12 176:17

179:7 183:21 184:7 234:16 246:19
visits 110:5 139:2
vista 57:17
visual 47:22 130:17 144:2 179:22 219:15
visually 172:18 180:21
visuals 186:2
vital 56:20
VIVIAN 2:15
Voids 67:4
volume 211:2
volumes 44:22 216:7
vote 8:18 17:10 79:9 84:11 137:16
voted 139:21
votes 90:16

W

wacky 254:21
waiting 88:15 239:19
walk 26:8 41:1 55:11 92:3 99:18 116:21 143:18,20 147:21 158:5 202:1,6 207:16 211:7
walkability 190:16
walkable 246:9
walked 81:13 188:19 212:22
walking 205:16 206:18 207:3 211:5
walks 144:21 186:10
walkway 98:15 151:15
wall 46:12,22 96:18 98:16 121:1,9 132:7 149:13 154:1,7,10 156:13,14 234:9 251:13
walls 22:12 25:13 43:12 45:14 46:19 62:20 95:19 97:9 98:5,6 104:22 120:7,17 122:13 125:11,16,18 126:3 129:5,14,17 130:3 131:15,22 132:9 143:18 147:10 147:10,10,10,10,11 149:11,11,11,18 152:22 153:2,12 155:20 156:15,15,16 156:18
Walt 117:2 122:18 123:19 124:22 133:1 144:9,10,19
Walter 4:10 217:19 218:2,11
wander 206:12
wanted 75:20 106:1 155:10,22 157:22 160:15 195:4 225:2 226:2 227:13 253:22
wanting 71:19
wants 218:9
war 113:7 115:20 118:3 118:7 123:20 135:7 136:2 144:4,12,14 145:8 147:22 148:4,5 149:12 150:18 151:19 153:4,11,15,20,22 157:5,7 158:4 162:6 162:10
warmth 254:16
warranted 226:19
Washington 1:10 4:6 4:10 27:10 60:5 113:17 120:12 140:13 155:5 163:3 164:21 185:15 217:19 218:2 218:11 246:4,7
Washington's 65:9
wasn't 139:7,14 177:4 208:18 255:19
waste 242:3
watching 159:13
water 38:5,10 62:17 63:16,17,19,21 64:3,5 64:6,17,22 65:21 66:13 67:9,16,18 119:5 149:5 168:9 190:17
water's 168:18
waterfront 51:7 58:7 119:2 185:18
waterproof 67:2 77:14
waterproofed 63:8
waterproofing 60:6,21 61:1,4,6 62:1,3,14,15 62:16,20 63:1,3 64:4 65:10 66:21,22 67:3 67:14,14 68:3,8,10
waters 188:5,5
waterway 175:18
way 37:15 44:12 58:6 65:14 78:2 84:20 85:11 97:19 103:13 111:5,11 114:19 117:18 153:17 156:1 159:4,13 162:21 165:13 176:19 194:15 200:6 205:18,18 211:9 227:22 245:18 246:6
ways 31:14 51:16 56:17 70:14 102:11 121:14 126:9 159:5 160:13 184:21 205:11 210:19 232:3 252:20
weak 66:12
weather-related 111:10
Webb 2:17 218:2
webcast 59:15
website 6:5 11:19
wedded 154:22
Wednesday 11:12
week 163:20,21
weighed 148:7 239:6
weight 67:7
Weil 2:18 231:6,7 250:1 256:13,14 257:11 258:12
welcome 5:4 18:8 60:14 69:3 70:15 72:11 95:13 102:18 135:6 231:6
welcomed 95:9
welcoming 31:11 57:2 57:17 91:19 93:18 95:10 98:15 100:16 111:9 118:1 154:4 228:19
well- 150:7
went 85:6 136:21 147:13 203:13 204:1 259:15
weren't 259:11
west 74:12 119:1 121:4 123:3 128:2,12 152:15 172:10,20 174:8 175:3 176:5 177:12,15 178:12,21 179:6,12,15,16 180:13,17 181:4 184:2,13 189:11,18 190:7,9 213:8 233:6 239:15 245:20 257:6
western 46:16 244:7
white 1:21 8:9 49:8 88:5 88:7,22 90:19,20 95:1 96:4 107:11 111:3,4 123:1,14 155:13,14 210:5 211:6 220:1 259:3
Whitman 117:2 122:18 123:19 125:1 133:1 144:10,10,19
wide 27:8 166:2 169:16 169:17 201:22 214:2 257:8,14
widened 242:4
wider 96:12
width 181:9 201:17 203:18,19 204:3,17 208:4 210:7 211:18 212:4,8 214:2
widths 181:16 203:12 211:14
wildlife 254:19,22,22 255:4
window 55:3
wins 204:22
wisdom 160:8
wish 12:2 78:1 148:21 189:12
Women's 72:1
wonderful 91:17 98:12 111:7 138:2
wondering 86:11 109:6 218:7
wooded 176:9 232:12
Woods 11:21
word 254:18
worded 111:6
wording 106:9 195:6 221:14
words 80:4 153:2
wordsmith 207:20
work 21:16 45:10 54:15 55:18 57:10 69:12 76:19 77:7,21 83:15 83:21 84:1 87:15 89:7 92:4 104:14 107:17 113:9,22 114:2 136:15 139:21 141:3 141:10 147:8 148:12 160:6 176:3 177:11 181:21 189:4,4,7,10 191:15 194:9 203:5 208:5 214:19 227:2,3 227:5
worked 12:1 22:22 53:14 61:1 136:13 144:10 211:15 212:7 255:14
workers 42:10 124:9 247:5
working 8:8 59:5 74:17 91:4 113:21 147:3 162:20 182:8 190:3 191:5
works 8:16 83:20 113:13 188:10,12 202:14 203:10 215:11
world 42:21 54:17 136:8 137:12 148:4,5 153:4,11
worried 202:8,9 203:4 205:20
worse 216:3 228:16
worst 149:2
worth 55:4,16 220:21
wouldn't 193:22

wounds 115:19
Wow 139:6
Wright 1:22 9:9,18 85:14,15 87:1 88:3 90:4 100:19,20 101:16,19,21 102:5 104:16 148:16 150:6 152:22 154:12,15 200:5,11 215:15 216:15 217:15 230:11 253:14 254:1,4 255:9 255:21 259:2
write 82:21 206:4
written 65:3 72:9 73:9 146:15 150:8 187:9
wrong 109:4
wrote 85:3

X

Y

year 8:4,5,7 9:8,13 63:15 69:11 82:17 163:15 185:7,21 231:1 233:20
years 11:22 16:14,21 19:3 23:7 35:2 38:1 44:1 53:11 55:22 65:11 68:6 70:10 74:16 86:1 93:1 136:7 140:21 157:8,8,18 165:22 169:2 181:22 184:3 207:1,2 232:18 235:8
yesterday 6:11 7:3 226:6 231:3,5 250:9 252:2 258:19
yield 154:12
yielded 150:3
York's 202:22
young 70:11 72:2

Z

zero 248:16

0

1

1,000 252:14
1,145 168:6
1.4 235:9
1.5 116:17 234:22
1.7 245:9
1.9 245:11
1/10th 250:11
1:00 1:10
1:08 5:2
10 68:6
10:30 11:14
100 104:22 139:17 207:1 230:15
100-hour 136:2
101 242:2,6 257:17,20
106 23:12,18 49:15 52:14 53:22 56:5 84:20 96:19
108 3:20
109 101:13
10th 34:17 35:18 94:7 94:14,22
11 3:5 11:12 82:17 170:4 183:14 201:16
111 98:1
112 3:6,22
113-291 113:6
12 3:7 11:14 54:8 95:11 210:2
129,000 61:18
12th 19:16
13th 183:3
14 167:8 210:9
15 167:22 235:10
15th 74:11 139:22
160 168:16
162 4:8
168 168:17 170:1 214:4 214:5
17 11:22 19:22
18 3:18 211:20 212:1,8 212:20 256:9,12,15 256:16
1800s 56:19
1890s 43:3
19 16:21
1950 165:3
1950s 232:20
1960s 144:17 233:18
1980s 39:20
1987 61:12
1991 137:1,13 158:4
1997 62:10
19th 122:19

2

2 11:2 120:3,19 146:11 239:16 244:11 245:1 245:12
2,600 252:12
2,672 234:19
20 19:3 35:1 53:11 141:16 157:8,8 165:22 168:18 184:3 196:7 207:2 235:8 242:4 243:3 252:3 256:9,12,16,17
20-year 235:17
2000 226:16 233:20
20004 1:10
2003 141:6
2005 166:9
2012 21:15
2013 57:7 164:9 167:6,9 167:15 172:21 177:13 178:20 208:17 217:16
2014 22:1 26:5 51:13
2016 43:18
2017 185:9
2018 1:7 5:5 18:6
2019 8:6
2021 191:18
20th 118:7 121:22 123:20 128:3 144:4 145:8 150:21 152:17 157:5
21 235:1
217 4:13
21st 56:21 157:7
230 4:19
23rd 117:6 137:17 138:9 139:3 140:15 140:20 145:3 150:12 152:13,20
25 244:20
250 157:18
259 4:21
26 88:9 90:10
27 136:7
270 232:11
2M 138:22

3

3 12:5 121:3 146:13 150:11 168:21 221:8 239:22 240:4
3,700 252:13
3.6 232:14
30 19:3 35:1 38:1 53:11 70:10 93:1 210:10 212:20 245:4 252:3 257:9
30,000 127:18
300 16:21
301 237:17
31 63:15 65:11 68:6
33 93:20
34 93:20 115:11 136:12
37 252:11

4

4 12:12 62:7 146:15 244:9
4,000 6:18 232:16
4,007 234:20
40 252:3
400 136:6
401 1:10
43 168:21
45 212:14
483 74:10
4A 12:14
4B 13:1
4C 14:1
4D 15:2

5

5 1:7 5:5
5:10 259:15
50 95:18 232:18
500 1:10
501(c)(6) 74:8
50th 162:9
5115 1:9
579- 232:8
5A 18:2
5B 108:9
5C 112:8
5D 163:6
5E 217:22
5F 230:18

6

6 3:2 17:19 62:7
6,000 250:10
6:00 11:12
60,000 59:15
600 6:18 250:10
600,000 136:5
60s 232:20 233:19
62 232:13

7

7 11:17 79:9
7:30 11:12
70 245:2
700 252:15
700,000 115:13
72 234:20
720-space 244:10
769 235:1
7th 19:16 135:11 225:3 226:12 227:20

8

8 3:4
80 233:19
800 69:8
801 217:18

9

9th 1:10

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Commission Meeting

Before: NCPD

Date: 04-05-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Neal R. Gross

Court Reporter