

Rehabilitation of Constitution Gardens

August 4, 2015

Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

2:00pm-4:00pm, Trust for the National Mall Headquarters
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. Suite 370
Washington, DC 20004

Attendees:

Mike Commisso (MC)	National Park Service, National Mall and Memorial Parks
Catherine Dewey (CD)	National Park Service, National Mall and Memorial Parks
Sean Kennealy (SK)	National Park Service, National Mall and Memorial Parks
Joe Coratola (JC)	National Park Service, National Mall and Memorial Parks
Joel Gorder (JG)	National Park Service, National Capital Region
Craig Chenevert (CC)	National Park Service, National Capital Region
Andrew Lewis (AL)	DC State Historic Preservation Office
F.J. Lindstrom (FL)	Commission of Fine Arts
Jennifer Hirsh (JH)	National Capital Planning Commission
Sarah Ridgely (SR)	National Capital Planning Commission
Meghan Spigle (MS)	National Capital Planning Commission
Julie Canter (JCa)	PWP Landscape Architecture
Teresa Durkin (TD)	Trust for the National Mall
John Whilden (JW)	Trust for the National Mall
John Fondersmith (JF)	The Committee of 100 on the Federal City

Purpose Section 106 Consultation meeting to receive updated information regarding the effects on historic resources within the affected area and to discuss the draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and any unresolved issues that were raised at the June Consulting Parties meeting.

Introduction Mike Commisso provided a brief summary of the purpose of the project and summarized the effects on historic resources within the area for the preferred alternative.

Effects Discussion

(New views and photo simulations were presented)

AL: Suggested minimizing the number of curb cuts.

FL: Requested a rendering of the service drive and suggested not placing a walkway adjacent to the ramp.

Potential New Effects and Adverse Effects

No Comments

Avoidance and Mitigation

AL: Questioned status of pavilion: Is it likely to change? It is still in design concept. Design will continue after Phase one is begun.

AL: Make sure the MOA addresses all adverse effects, including the potential for cumulative adverse effects of the proposed pavilion.

TD: Wanted to preserve existing views to the WWII Memorial so the pavilion was moved closer to the lake from its originally conceived location from the SOM plan. Moving the pavilion slightly west also allowed the event plaza. Concessions and other support functions integral to the site will be located in the pavilion. However, those functions and their programming still need refinements.

AL: Is this the right character for COGA? If a commission member questions the design we need to ensure historic preservation issues are addressed.

FL: Asked if there was a design for the original pavilion? Yes and it looked like a "Pizza Hut" building.

JF: Brought up previous comments submitted by the Committee of 100, specifically the moving of the lockkeeper's house, creation of views to the DC War Memorial from Constitution Gardens, and concerns that the proposed 18" wall would change the open character along Constitution Avenue

ANSWER: The NPS confirmed the movement of the Lockkeeper's house and shared illustrated graphics. Despite the request to have a view from COGA to the DC War Memorial, the consensus was that the existing view would be maintained, but would not be further opened because of the trees lining the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool. Finally, the NPS explained that the berm along Constitution Avenue has been reduced, but confirmed that adding the wall should be considered in the cumulative adverse effects.

JF: With trees shown in the center of the dual walks it seems to seal off Con Ave entrances.

TD: Design was made visually more porous with clear entry ways.

FL: Based on current design, the crosswalks have been realigned to ensure a safer entry. The 18" walls can act as a seat and are easy enough to step over.

JCa: The wall also allows for a better edge to amend the soils and is welcoming that allows seating and reinvigorates the edge of the park.

TD: A full clear cut was not possible, so the wall helps hold in soil

AL: It is a change in character so it should be considered a cumulative adverse effect.

Memorandum of Agreement Discussion:

AL: Add that the LKH has been previously moved; either a new whereas clause or adding to the existing statement.

AL: In reference to whereas clause 10, state that this rehabilitation will ensure that these mitigation measures are implemented.

AL: In reference to whereas clauses 17 through 19, add the new adverse effect of the construction of the 18-inch wall and remove the term mitigating (19).

AL: Is mitigation enough for Phase 2?

JH: Do we want additional consultation?

MC: Stipulation that addresses – do we need to provide more detail?

Phase 1 Stipulations were discussed

FL: In reference to phase 1, I suggest adding As-built drawings to HABS documentation

JF: Questioned specifics of LKH move – team clarified where it was moving to

AL: Make sure LKH move is only addressed in Phase 1 not both Phases

JH: Question about when 36-48 months begins – determined this means at commencement of Phase 2 construction

AL: Clarify: refinement of design and construction of the pavilion. The final design and operation of the pavilion will affect how the access drive is designed. Is there an alternative design? There was consideration of different locations schemes, but it would mix service vehicles with pedestrian traffic. These issues were examined in the EA and it is too difficult to resolve any other way.

General: As an example of an interpretative element that could be incorporated at the LKH, a conceptual idea of a visual projection on the building was shared. However, it received less than favorable reactions and was discouraged.

AL: Reminded us that the sewer outfall keystone should be added into interpretation. Stones should be re-used and incorporated.

Phase 2 Stipulations were discussed

AL: HABS documentation should be completed before construction begins. Agreed – that is plan.

AL: Stipulation about design review - may have minor tweaks

JH: She suggested language to massage paragraph: Re-evaluation of Final (check) consultation. Revise to ensure design modifications occur before CFA and NCPC approval for Phase 2. Move to earlier clause (Letter G)

AL: DCSHPO will not accept URL's so we need to be aware of what we are adding as attachments – summaries are fine

Clarified: Phase 1 is the NE corner, moving the LKH adding a plaza, adjusting path and landscape.

Next Steps

The presentation and minutes will be posted to PEPC.

The draft Memorandum of Agreement for the project will be sent to the Consulting parties for their review. Park anticipates it being signed and finalized by August 28th.

The park anticipates the project going for CFA review on September 17th and NCPC review on October 1st.

The proposed Phase 1 description: The Lockkeeper's House move is an independent part of the project that the park hopes to complete by the August 2016 centennial celebration.

The park plans to complete the rehabilitation project in 2018