

NATIONAL MALL

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

TO

REVIEW MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING ISSUES FOR THE NATIONAL
MALL, INCLUDING THE HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT, SECURITY
PROJECTS, AND OTHER PLANNED CONSTRUCTION, AND FUTURE DE-
VELOPMENT PLANS

APRIL 12, 2005



Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

21-726 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2005

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

PETE V. DOMENICI, *New Mexico, Chairman*

LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho	JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee	BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska	RON WYDEN, Oregon
RICHARD M. BURR, North Carolina,	TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MEL MARTINEZ, Florida	MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri	DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California
CONRAD BURNS, Montana	MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia	JON S. CORZINE, New Jersey
GORDON SMITH, Oregon	KEN SALAZAR, Colorado
JIM BUNNING, Kentucky	

ALEX FLINT, *Staff Director*

JUDITH K. PENSABENE, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT M. SIMON, *Democratic Staff Director*

SAM E. FOWLER, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

CRAIG THOMAS, *Wyoming, Chairman*

LAMAR ALEXANDER, *Tennessee, Vice Chairman*

GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
RICHARD M. BURR, North Carolina	RON WYDEN, Oregon
MEL MARTINEZ, Florida	MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
GORDON SMITH, Oregon	JON S. CORZINE, New Jersey
	KEN SALAZAR, Colorado

PETE V. DOMENICI and JEFF BINGAMAN are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

THOMAS LILLIE, *Professional Staff Member*

DAVID BROOKS, *Democratic Senior Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Akaka, Hon. Daniel K., U.S. Senator from Hawaii	2
Childs, David M., Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts	16
Cogbill, John V., III, Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission	11
Cooper, Kent, Coordinator, National Mall Third Century Initiative	8
Parsons, John, Associate Regional Director for Lands, Resources and Plan- ning, National Capital Region, National Park Service	3
Salazar, Hon. Ken, U.S. Senator from Colorado	19
Thomas, Hon. Craig, U.S. Senator from Wyoming	1

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions	29
---	----

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record	43
--	----

NATIONAL MALL

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 2005

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:31 p.m., in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Craig Thomas presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CRAIG THOMAS, U.S. SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Senator THOMAS. The committee will come to order.

Thank you all for being here. I want to welcome John Parsons from the National Park Service and our other witnesses for today's subcommittee hearing.

The purpose of our hearing today is to receive testimony on the history of the National Mall, current construction projects, and security efforts, and the future for the Mall.

Without a doubt, the National Mall is a special place to the country and to its government. It serves as a gathering place for special events and as a place for commemorating the history of our Nation, its struggles, and its leaders.

Each morning as I go to work, I admire the beauty of the Mall and the monuments and all those things and the symbols of major events and the people of this Nation.

During the last few years, we have had several substantial additions and changes to the Mall: the FDR, the Korean War, and the World War II memorials, as well as the Vietnam Memorial Visitors Center, and the American Indian Museum. So to continue to make additions is a question I think that we all have.

I wanted to read this little portion. Concerned with the number of new commemorative works authorized and constructed on the Mall, Congress amended the Commemorative Works Act in 2003 to declare the Mall to be "a substantially completed work of civic art." The 2003 amendments defined the Mall and certain adjacent areas as the Reserve and prohibited the construction of any new memorial or visitor center within that area. The 2003 amendments also, for the first time, provided a formal legislative definition of the Mall, defining it as an area extending "from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial."

History has brought many changes to the National Mall that reflect progression of the Nation's development. The National Mall

stands at the doorstep of its third century. In order for this premier civic landscape to maintain the highest degree of integrity, a concerted planning effort is needed. The public, government agencies, private entities, advocacy groups concerned with the future of the Mall must work together. In doing so, they have the opportunity to plan a vision of the National Mall for the next century.

So that is really, I think, our challenge here today as we approach it here. We have to talk about where will visitors park in the future, where will they get all the public sites. Does the National Park Service intend to expand the tour mobile operation? Does the National Park Service have a master plan for the Mall? Does Congress need to establish a planning group similar to the McMillan Commission for the next century? These are only a few of the questions that we have.

So we will move on. Senator, do you have any opening comments?

**STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA, U.S. SENATOR
FROM HAWAII**

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for scheduling this hearing on issues affecting the National Mall. It is very appropriate for the subcommittee to not only look at the immediate issues concerning the Mall but also to the Mall's long-term management and its development.

Generally, our subcommittee hearings cover legislative proposals, so we typically consider Mall-related issues on a piecemeal basis, one new memorial or visitor center at a time. However, it is important that we also look at the bigger picture so we can address the complete vision of how the Mall could be and what it should be.

The National Mall is a unique area, serving many important purposes. It is home to many of the most significant icons of our country. It is also one of the most visible places in the Nation for public protests and marches and other First Amendment expressions, and it is a very important recreational area for large celebrations such as the Fourth of July festivities, the Cherry Blossom Festival, and smaller, everyday activities such as family picnics, jogging, and softball games.

As the number of monument and museum proposals has increased over the years, many have expressed concern about overdevelopment of the Mall. In response and based in large part on the recommendations of the agencies appearing here today, Congress passed legislation in 2003 precluding the construction of new memorials or visitor centers on the Mall. However, we still face pressure to approve additional memorials in locations of prominence that will satisfy memorial proponents.

An additional issue involves the ongoing construction of the national security projects around many of these memorials. While I do not question the need to ensure that appropriate security needs are addressed, I am concerned that large portions of the Mall have been essentially closed to public use for long periods of time. Although the Washington Monument has just reopened to visitors after a lengthy closure, the monument grounds continue to be fenced off. Likewise, public access to the Jefferson Memorial is now much more difficult with the closure of the adjacent parking lot. I

hope to hear more from the Park Service today about the steps that it is taking to ensure that fences, barricades, and walls will not be the most prominent features of the Mall.

Finally, I hope to learn more about proposals for expanding the Mall or creating other areas about the capital to allow for the commemoration of important events in our Nation's history. There have been several proposals such as the National Capital Planning Commission's Legacy Plan and the National Coalition to Save Our Mall's Third Century initiative.

I would like to welcome our four distinguished witnesses today to the hearing. This should be a very informative hearing and I look forward to their testimony.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Senator.

It is interesting and, of course, historic. Another little piece out of the background. The National Mall's origins are as old as the capital itself. The open space and the parks envisioned by the Pierre L'Enfant's plan, which was commissioned by George Washington, created an ideal stage.

Then down a little further it is kind of interesting. In 1892, acknowledging the grounds represented more than merely a physical setting of buildings, Congress separated the Federal management of grounds from buildings with the creation of the National Capital Park System.

So this is something that has been going on for a long time, and as we should in most things, I hope we can sort of develop a vision of what we think the Mall ought to look like in 10 or 20 or 50 years from now so that in the interim we can do the things that will cause it to be what we want it to be at that time.

Let us welcome our witnesses this morning. We are very pleased to have you all here. Mr. John Parsons, Associate Regional Director for Lands, Resources, and Planning, National Capital Region, National Park Service; Mr. Kent Cooper, architect, Washington, DC; Mr. John Cogbill, Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; and Mr. David Childs, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. If you will take your places up here, gentlemen, thank you.

We are going to have some votes in a little less than an hour, so we are going to try and move through this fairly expeditiously, but we want to hear all that you have to say. Your full statements will be put into the record.

Mr. Parsons, if you would care to start, sir.

STATEMENT OF JOHN PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. PARSONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I will abbreviate the testimony that has been provided to you so that can be inserted in the record so we can move along.

I want to thank you and members of the subcommittee for bringing these hearings forward. It is a very important time in this city.

I am John Parsons, Associate Regional Director of the Park Service here in Washington, and it is my pleasure to appear before you today to talk about the future of the National Mall. We are ex-

tremely proud to be the stewards of the Nation's front yard, which has become known as the National Mall.

In 1791, at the direction of President Washington, Pierre L'Enfant, a French engineer, produced a plan for the Nation's capital. The L'Enfant plan, which is shown behind me here, delineated an east-west boulevard that extended from the hill upon which the Capitol would be located, one mile west to a site he identified for the Washington Monument. There it intersected with the north-south axis to a hill where he sited the President's house. But by the end of the 19th century, the area was a patchwork of inconsistent and fragmented uses, as you can see here.

In 1900, Senator James McMillan, who was chairman of the District of Columbia, recognized the erosion of the L'Enfant plan and established a commission to study the issue. The commission's McMillan Plan doubled the size of the Mall by extending its east-west axis, one mile to the site of the Lincoln Memorial and one-half mile to the south, which is anchored by the Jefferson Memorial.

In 1910, the Congress established and charged the Commission of Fine Arts to ensure that the McMillan Plan for the National Mall was completed with the highest degree of civic art. In 1926, Congress established the National Capital Planning Commission to ensure the continuation of good planning for the city in the tradition of L'Enfant and McMillan. One of the McMillan Commission's recommendations had been to place the National Mall under the administration of one agency to avoid the re-emergence of the patchwork of competing and conflicting uses.

In 1935, the National Park Service was given the responsibility of managing this park. The NPS implemented the grand axis of the Mall by removing hundreds of trees and the informal gardens that existed and replacing them with the elm tree panels that you see here that are the Mall's centerpiece today. And they did not have to do an environmental impact statement.

[Laughter.]

Mr. PARSONS. The result of the successful implementation of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans is a uniquely designed American landscape, one that must remain as open and energetic as our democracy.

As the 20th century drew to a close, it became apparent that implementation of all remaining elements of the McMillan Plan that were feasible were being completed. In 1990, the NCPC initiated a new public planning process for the city's urban core. This framework plan was completed by NCPC in 1997 to guide the long-term growth and is called Extending the Legacy. The Legacy Plan, shown behind me, protects the integrity of the National Mall as we know it today, and establishes North, South, and East Capitol Streets as the axis of new growth for commemorative works and museums. This vision built upon and replaced the McMillan Plan with a vision for the 21st century.

On November 17, 2003, under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, Congress concurred with the principles of the Legacy Plan and declared the National Mall a completed work of civic art by establishing the Reserve. The National Mall is now protected from any future construction of memorials. The Reserve, together with the Legacy Plan, has lessened urgent development pressures on the

National Mall and thus created an ideal circumstance for the National Park Service to begin the planning for long-term preservation and enhancement of this historic landscape.

We are working with NCPD and the District of Columbia to enhance the development of South Capitol Street as a major corridor in the city. South Capitol Street will become a grand boulevard with a major urban park at its terminus on the Anacostia River. This boulevard is envisioned as an adjunct to the monumental core that will evolve and mature with its own identity like other special avenues in the Nation's capital, such as Pennsylvania, Connecticut, or Massachusetts Avenues.

In 2003, the National Park Service entered into a partnership agreement with the Trust for the National Mall, a private, non-profit organization, which was established to assist us in raising funds for the enhancements to move the National Mall to a new level of excellence. While the National Park Service's 1972 plan for the National Mall and subsequent plans for parts of the area provide guidance, we acknowledge there is no single current plan focusing on the long-term management of the National Mall. This is something we intend to rectify.

We have begun a public planning process that would result in the National Mall comprehensive management plan. The plan will examine the following issues: enhance the identity of the National Mall; preservation of the historic landscape and character; maintenance of the National Mall for First Amendment activities, special events, and national cultural heritage, and recreation; accommodation of jurisdictional missions of the National Park Service and neighboring agencies.

In conclusion, I would like to thank Chairman Thomas for his leadership in the protection of the National Mall, particularly the careful study and development of the area now established as the Reserve. Your stewardship of this special place has enabled us to keep intact the core of President Washington's intended planning for our Nation's front yard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Parsons follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is my pleasure to appear before you today to discuss the National Park Service's management and planning for the National Mall.

The National Park Service is extremely proud to be the steward of the nation's front yard, which has come to be known as the National Mall. Designed by Pierre L'Enfant and established by President George Washington and Thomas Jefferson in 1791, this grand open space has been jointly nurtured and guided by the Executive, Congressional, and Judicial branches of government for over two centuries.

L'ENFANT PLAN—19TH CENTURY VISION

In 1791, Pierre L'Enfant, a French designer, established a plan to serve as the framework for the Capital city of Washington, DC. This plan, known as the L'Enfant Plan, (Exhibit A)* delineated an east/west boulevard that extended from the hill upon which the Capitol would be located, one mile west to a site identified for the Washington Monument, where it intersected with the north/south axis where he sited the President's house on a hill to the north. While the design of the L'Enfant Plan remains in place today, implementation during the 19th century was

*The exhibits have been retained in subcommittee files.

slow to non-existent. In fact, by the end of the 19th century, the area was a patchwork of, in some cases, jarringly inconsistent and fragmented uses, such as a railroad station and individual landscapes managed by a host of different agencies and organizations.

MCMILLAN PLAN—20TH CENTURY VISION

In 1900, Senator James McMillan, who was chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia, recognized the erosion of the L'Enfant Plan for the area and the city at large. He created a commission of preeminent architects, planners, and designers who created a new vision that reinforced L'Enfant's principles and restored the area's historic sweep. This 1901 plan, known as the McMillan Plan, (See Exhibit B) doubled the area's size by extending its east/west axis one mile to the site of the Lincoln Memorial, and one-half mile to the south, which is anchored by the Jefferson Memorial on axis with the White House. This grand plan has resulted in this magnificent landscape, which is the National Mall. Flanked by federal museums that contain our national treasures and punctuated by national memorials that celebrate our nation's most important persons and events, the National Mall has evolved into a powerful symbol of democracy for this nation throughout the world.

In 1910, Congress established and charged the Commission of Fine Arts to ensure that the McMillan Plan for the National Mall was completed with the highest degree of civic art. In 1926, Congress established the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) to ensure the continuation of good planning for the city in the tradition of L'Enfant and McMillan. In 1935, the National Park Service was given the responsibility of managing this park where the people of this country and the world come for education, celebration, demonstration, and recreation. One of the McMillan Commission's recommendations had been to place the National Mall under the administration of one agency to avoid the re-emergence of the patchwork of competing and conflicting uses.

While widely supported, the McMillan Plan was not without detractors. Even with the hard work and perseverance of Congress, the Executive Branch, and others, restoring L'Enfant's vision through the implementation of the McMillan Plan took most of the 20th Century. The result of the successful implementation of the L'Enfant and the McMillan Plans is a uniquely designed American landscape—one that must remain as open and energetic as our democracy. We have managed this public space for the American people with care and in consultation with adjacent Federal agencies under the McMillan Plan guidance.

LEGACY PLAN—21ST CENTURY VISION

As the 20th Century drew to a close, it became apparent that, with the completion of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, World War II Memorial, and National Museum of the American Indian, implementation of all the remaining elements of the McMillan Plan that were feasible would be complete. At the same time, there was increasing concern about the growing number of proposals for memorials and museums being placed on the National Mall. Consequently, in 1990, the NCPC initiated a new public planning process for the city's urban core. As with the McMillan Plan, the NCPC engaged a group of preeminent architects, planners, and designers to assist in this effort. This framework plan was completed by the NCPC in 1997 to guide long-term growth and is called "Extending the Legacy," as it is based on the legacy of the two landmark plans, the L'Enfant Plan and the McMillan Plan. The Legacy Plan (See Exhibit C) protects the integrity of the National Mall, as we know it today, and, among its recommendations, it establishes North, South, and East Capitol Streets as they radiate from the Capitol, as the axis of new growth for commemorative works, museums and other public facilities. The National Park Service supports the goals and vision of the Legacy Plan as the 21st Century plan for the nation's Capital and will continue to work with others toward its successful implementation.

THE COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT AND THE RESERVE

In 1986, following what some characterized as "monumental chaos" over the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which was dedicated in 1982, Congress enacted the Commemorative Works Act to guide the process for establishing memorials in the nation's Capital. The Commemorative Works Act sets forth the requirements on subject matter, siting, and design of memorials. It also creates the procedure for establishing memorials on parkland, including the approval of both site and design by National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Secretary of the Interior. Since its enactment, the Commemorative Works Act has played an important role in ensuring that memorials in the nation's Capital are

erected on the most appropriate sites and are of a caliber in design that is worthy of their historically significant subjects.

On November 17, 2003, under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, Congress concurred with principles of the Legacy Plan and declared the National Mall complete by establishing the Reserve (See Exhibit D) through an amendment to the Commemorative Works Act. With the creation of the Reserve under Public Law 108-126, the National Mall is now protected from any future construction of memorials or museums within this completed work of civic art. Your Congressional action creating the Reserve, together with the Legacy Plan's refocus on the importance of the Capitol, has lessened urgent development pressures on the National Mall and thus created ideal circumstances for the National Park Service to begin the planning for long-term preservation and enhancement of this historic landscape.

ONGOING PLANNING

The National Park Service is working with current memorial proponents to ensure that siting of memorials is guided by the Memorials and Museums Master Plan. This 2001 master plan was an outgrowth of the Legacy Plan and redirects proponents away from the Reserve to worthy sites throughout the city as well as sites in the Monumental Core, which extends from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and Arlington Cemetery and from the White House to the Potomac River. We currently are working with the proponents of seven Congressionally authorized memorials and are guiding them to sites identified in the Memorials and Museums Master Plan. Four memorials have already received site approvals using the Master Plan.

The National Park Service is working with NCPD and the District of Columbia to support the South Capitol Street corridor that will enhance the river park system, Mayor Anthony Williams' Anacostia Waterfront Initiative, and the site for the new baseball stadium. As proposed, South Capitol Street would become a grand boulevard with a major urban park at its terminus on the Anacostia River. (See Exhibit E) A revitalized South Capitol Street is the centerpiece of the Mayor's Initiative and would be invigorated through major private investment in mixed-use development, including cultural institutions, housing, and retail. While South Capitol Street would provide multiple sites for cultural institutions, museums and memorials as well as parkland, it is not envisioned that this streetscape would be managed by the National Park Service. The revitalization of South Capitol Street will ensure that sites for major memorials are set aside for future generations as called for in the Legacy Plan and the Memorials and Museums Master Plan. While the Legacy Plan establishes the framework for these emergent areas north, and south of the Capitol, these areas are envisioned as adjuncts to the Monumental Core that will evolve and mature with their own identity, like the other special avenues in the nation's Capital such as Connecticut or Massachusetts Avenues.

In 2003, the National Park Service entered into a partnership agreement with the Trust for the National Mall, a private nonprofit organization established to assist in the raising of funds for enhancements. The agreement authorizes the Trust to raise funds and in-kind donations for National Park Service restoration, revitalization and maintenance projects. The agreement is part of a long-term partnership designed to enhance the National Mall's prominence and relevance to the diverse communities it serves. Funds raised by the Trust are intended to move the National Mall to a new level of excellence.

The National Park Service has numerous projects under construction involving the roads, security, and environs of the memorials and symbols of our democracy as well as the streets and avenues of the National Mall, including the preservation of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, security improvements designed to be compatible with the historic character of the Washington Monument and Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and pedestrian and traffic safety improvements at Lincoln Circle and at Ohio Drive along the Potomac River. These projects have all benefited from the public planning process used by the National Park Service in their development.

Despite the fact that in considering these projects, the National Park Service assessed the effect of each on the National Mall, there, nevertheless, have been concerns expressed that planning for individual projects erodes the overall integrity of the National Mall. We have listened to these concerns and seek to address them.

While the National Park Service 1972 plan for the National Mall and subsequent plans for parts of the area provide guidance, we acknowledge there is no single current plan focusing on National Park Service management of the National Mall. This is something the National Park Service intends to rectify. The National Mall regularly experiences extremely high levels of use and landscape conditions have suf-

ferred. This must be addressed in planning. The planning process must be open and inclusive—the witnesses today and the American public will all be participants with us in this important effort to preserve existing landmark plans by planning for future use. The National Park Service has begun a public planning process that would result in the National Mall Comprehensive Management Plan. The plan will examine the following issues:

- enhancement of the identity of the National Mall,
- preservation of the historic landscape and character,
- improved landscape maintenance,
- maintenance of the National Mall for First Amendment activities, special events, and national cultural heritage and recreation,
- sustainable use levels,
- accommodation of jurisdictional missions of the National Park Service, District of Columbia, Architect of the Capitol, General Services Administration, Smithsonian, and the National Gallery of Art,
- preservation and protection of the open space of the Reserve in fulfillment of legislative mandates, and
- continuation and support of a vibrant urban life.

Everyone here cares deeply about the National Mall and is concerned about maintaining its open space and character for the future. Historic planning sets an indelible course, one that continues to enrich our nation. Planning now for future use and preservation is vital.

In conclusion, I would like to thank Chairman Thomas for his leadership in the protection of the National Mall, particularly the careful study and development of the areas now established as the Reserve. Your stewardship of this special place has enabled us to keep intact the core of President George Washington's intended planning for our nation's front yard. This concludes my prepared remarks. I will be pleased to answer any questions you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you very much.
Mr. Cooper.

**STATEMENT OF KENT COOPER, COORDINATOR, NATIONAL
MALL THIRD CENTURY INITIATIVE**

Mr. COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for conducting this hearing today and providing us with an opportunity to share our views. My name is W. Kent Cooper. I am the coordinator for the task force work that is being undertaken by the National Mall conservancy, the Third Century Mall initiative.

This initiative is a product of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall. It is a volunteer organization focused on the preservation and enhancement of the National Mall.

Over the last 18 months, through a series of public forums and meetings, the public has spoken very strongly of their concerns about the state of the National Mall and their interest in preserving it for a third century.

The National Mall already embodies two great visions, as John has said, the L'Enfant Plan of 1791 and the McMillan Plan of 1902. Today we need to renew these historic concepts and plan for the next 100 years.

We have three main points to share with you today.

One, in the 20th century, the Mall took on a new meaning for the public. It became the stage for our democracy, a place of celebration, recreation, demonstration, and healing. Now we need to create policies that enhance that public use, rather than restrict that use.

Two, the existing Mall is not visitor friendly. When your constituents come to the Mall this summer, they are going to find nu-

merous barriers, few places to sit, little convenient and good food, long walks in the hot sun to get from place to place. The Mall needs more visitor amenities, including more things to do in the public open space.

Three, the Mall is full. Congress recognized this problem and issued the moratorium, at least some memorials and visitor centers. But history cannot be stopped. Future generations will want to build memorials and some will deserve a place on the Mall. The Mall should expand and meet this need as it did a century ago. In short, the Mall needs a vision to carry us into the next 100 years, a Third Century Mall.

There is room to expand. Readily available Federal open land, together with public rights of way, such as South Capitol Street and the L'Enfant Promenade, would create a continuous route from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, along a 2-mile stretch of the Potomac River front. We need only to bridge the Washington Channel to complete that loop.

In order to plan for the Mall's future, we also need to confront certain administrative problems.

First, the Mall needs to be more carefully defined. The Congressional Research Service found that there is no agreement as to where the Mall begins and ends.

Second, at least seven different agencies have management authority over the Mall. A coordinating body is desperately needed.

We call upon Congress to take the following actions. For the long term, establish a National Mall conservancy or a board of regents. Such an entity would establish and maintain key operating policies for the entire Mall in collaboration with the Federal stakeholders and the public.

This board should also be responsible for long-term master planning, including the assembling of a McMillan-type commission to develop a vision for the next 100 years, the Third Century Mall vision.

And finally, the board should report to Congress regularly on the state of the National Mall.

Now, in the short run, there are several steps Congress could take while the conservancy or board of regents is being formed. We ask Congress to begin now drafting legislation which declares the National Mall to be a single entity, encompassing all of the lands under the jurisdiction of the various stakeholders, extending from the Capitol and including the Capitol to the banks of the Potomac.

And we ask Congress to authorize several pilot projects which might make the Mall more visitor friendly. The Third Century initiative has already begun work on one of these. We are now completing the first-ever Mall map and historic guide. A mock-up of this is in your packet.

Several other projects have been studied but not begun. We ask Congress to authorize the initiative to develop, coordinate with the Park Service, and implement several trial projects, some of which might be in place by even this summer. A priority would be a pilot food cart and park furniture program, possibly modeled on the recent visitor friendly renovation of Bryant Park in New York City.

In conclusion, in order to help all of us understand what a Third Century Mall might be like, we prepared a sketch. You have it in

your possession I think. Can we uncover the sketch here please?
Many other possibilities exist for this.

I thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Cooper follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KENT COOPER, COORDINATOR, NATIONAL MALL
THIRD CENTURY INITIATIVE

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee for conducting this hearing today and providing us with an opportunity to present our views on the Third Century Mall. We appreciate and admire the leadership you have brought to this subject.

The Third Century Mall Initiative, a project of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall, is a volunteer organization dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the National Mall for future generations.

Over the last 18 months through a series of public forums and meetings, the public has spoken very strongly about their concerns about the state of the Mall, as well as their strong interest in preserving it in a lasting fashion for its Third Century.

The National Mall represents the legacy of two great visions, the L'Enfant Plan of 1791 and the McMillan Plan of 1901-1902. For 200 years L'Enfant's original concept of the Mall as symbol of our founding ideals and place of the People has been changing and growing to meet the needs of our democracy. Today, with the Mall facing urgent issues and problems, we need to renew the Mall's historic concept and plan for the next one hundred years.

We have three main points:

1. As the Nation grew and evolved, the Mall took on new meaning for the public in the twentieth century.

Its public open space became the stage for our democracy—a place of celebration, recreation, demonstration, and healing. Today's Mall is as much about public use of the open space as it is about memorials and museums. But increasingly the Mall is being treated as a theme park, to be experienced by tour bus. We need to create policies that enhance public use rather than restrict it.

2. The existing Mall is not visitor friendly.

When your constituents come to the Mall this summer, they're going to find barriers, too few places to sit, lack of convenient and good food, and long walks in the hot sun to get from place to place. The Mall needs more visitor amenities and things to do in the public open space.

3. The Mall is full.

Congress recognized this problem and issued a moratorium on further memorials and visitor centers. It declared the Mall a "substantially completed work of civic art." The National Capital Planning Commission named numerous new building sites around the city with its Memorials and Museums Master Plan. But history can't be stopped. Dozens of memorial projects are already waiting for sites. Future generations will want to build memorials and some will deserve a place "on the Mall." The Mall should expand to meet this need, as it did a century ago.

In short, the National Mall needs a vision to carry us into the next 100 years—a Third Century Mall. The vision should recover and renew the Mall's historic concept as the People's place. And it should allow the Mall to expand and continue to commemorate our nation's memories in inspiring memorials and majestic public open space.

There is room to expand. Readily available federal open land with public rights of way such as South Capitol Street and the L'Enfant Promenade would create a continuous route from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial along a two-mile stretch of the Potomac riverfront. We need only to bridge the Washington Channel to complete the loop. This concept, devised by the National Mall Third Century Initiative, would be as sensitive to today's environment as was the Beaux-Arts/City Beautiful concept to McMillan.

This sketch is not offered as a formal design, rather as a vision. There are many other possibilities for such an expansion.

In order to plan for the Mall's future, we also need to confront certain administrative problems.

1. The Mall is undefined.

The Initiative found that there is no agreement as to where the Mall begins and where it ends. The Congressional Research Service confirms this finding. The Mall needs to be defined.

2. Management of the Mall is fragmented.

At least seven separate agencies have management authority over the Mall. The Mall needs a coordinating body.

As the ultimate steward of the Mall, Congress has an important role to play in determining the future of this national treasure. Accordingly, we call upon Congress to take the following long-term and short-term actions.

LONG TERM: Congress should establish a National Mall Conservancy or a Board of Regents. This entity would establish policies for the entire Mall in collaboration with the federal stakeholder agencies and the public and would continually review and update those policies. Similar to the Board of Regents for the Smithsonian Institution—which Congress recently directed to solve site selection for the African-American Museum—this Board would strengthen Congressional oversight of the Mall. It should be composed of members of Congress and distinguished Americans—historians, business leaders, planners, artists, and educators of national stature.

The Board should be authorized by Congress to be responsible for long-term master planning, including:

1. Assembling a year-long, McMillan-type Planning Commission to develop a long-term vision for the next 100 years—the Third Century Mall. The vision would include enhancing the existing Mall as well as expanding it to create a Third Century Mall. Once completed, that framework would be used by all stakeholders as well as by the review agencies to guide future development.
2. Developing policies such as Mall-wide security, access, permits, public use, transportation, parking, and visitor amenities.
3. Reporting regularly to Congress on the state of the Mall.

SHORT TERM: There are several steps Congress could take now while the Conservancy or Board of Regents is being formed. We ask Congress to immediately:

1. *Draft legislation that declares the National Mall a single entity encompassing all the lands under the jurisdiction of the various stakeholder agencies and extending from the Capitol to the banks of the Potomac.*

The legislation should take note of the evolving nature of the Mall and allow for its future expansion. This statutory definition would form the basis of all future planning.

2. *Authorize several pilot projects to make the Mall more visitor friendly.*

The Third Century Initiative has already begun work to answer some of the Mall's needs. We are now completing our first project—a first-ever Mall map and historic guide. The Initiative is funding this project as a public service.

We ask Congress to authorize the Third Century Initiative to develop, coordinate with the National Park Service and other stakeholders, and implement a few short-term, trial projects, some of which could be in place for this summer. These projects could be evaluated after three months and either renewed or retired. A priority would be a trial food cart and park furniture program, perhaps modeled on the recent visitor-friendly renovation of Bryant Park in New York City.

Other projects that could be implemented in coming months include musical and theatrical performances and a turf grass demonstration program.

Creating a First Amendment Park on the Mall—perhaps a simple landscaped area at the foot of Capitol Hill—is another idea. Similar to Speaker's Corner at Hyde Park in London, it would reinforce the Mall's core symbolism while offering individuals an inspiring symbolic place to exercise free speech.

In conclusion, the public has stated its concerns and they are real. We see today the effects of the barricades, lack of access, and disjointed amenities. You have given us a wonderful opportunity today to address these concerns and propose ways to improve in the short-term some of the immediate difficulties the public faces, and to sculpt a comprehensive and lasting memorial for all people—the Third Century Mall. Yes, there are challenges, but there are also prospects for greatness.

I am happy to expand on any of these ideas.

Senator THOMAS. We do have the papers that you mentioned.
Mr. Cogbill.

STATEMENT OF JOHN V. COGBILL, III, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. COGBILL. Good afternoon, Chairman Thomas and members of the subcommittee. My name is John Cogbill, and I am the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, known to most of you as NCPC. Congress originally established NCPC in 1924 as

the park planning agency for the national capital. The agency has since evolved into the Federal Government's central planning agency in the National Capital Region. I am honored to have this opportunity to speak with you about the National Mall and NCPC's work throughout the years to establish a 21st century vision for our National Capital Region and the National Mall.

We recognize that there are continuing demands for commemorative, interpretive, and other uses in this historic and symbolic landscape that we know as the National Mall. We support the efforts to complete a long-term master plan for the Mall, which we believe would compliment the visionary, long-term planning for the expansion of Washington's monumental core, as outlined in NCPC's Legacy Plan released in 1997 and the Memorials and Museums Master Plan approved in 2001.

NCPC's Legacy is the long-term vision for the national capital. Legacy lays out a 50 to 100-year vision for our Nation's capital and is the result of a multi-year effort in collaboration with all of the major Federal landholding agencies, the Congress, the public, and preeminent architects, planners, historians, and other experts.

The Legacy Plan addresses the demand for ever-increasing development on the Mall by calling for an expansion of the area we know as Washington's monumental core. The monumental core currently consists of the Mall and the areas immediately beyond it, including Pennsylvania Avenue and the Federal Triangle, East and West Potomac Parks, the Southwest Federal Center, Arlington Cemetery, and even the Pentagon.

Legacy would further expand the monumental core into other areas of Washington. It would provide new areas for memorials, museums, public recreation space, and other public buildings that would enhance Washington's larger urban fabric and assist in the city's ongoing economic development.

The original L'Enfant Plan in 1791 set out Washington's original form based on the grand use of axial avenues and streets. In 1901, responding to a desire to extend the L'Enfant Plan's framework, Congress established the McMillan Commission. The McMillan Commission's plan for the Mall called for a reconfiguration and westward extension on newly filled land. Reinforcing L'Enfant's themes, the McMillan Commission further highlighted the relationship among the grand axial streets and major public buildings along the Mall.

The Legacy Plan and the Commemorative Works Act recognized the Mall as a substantially completed work of civic art that must be preserved and maintained. The Mall's completeness refers to the fact that its historic landscape, its defined visual and geographic form, its historic views, and its fixed iconic points, such as the Washington Monument and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, comprise a whole that should not be overwhelmed by new monuments or commemorative buildings.

However, substantially complete does not mean unchanging. Therefore, Legacy proposes expanding the monumental core beyond the Mall and the traditional center of Washington to North, South and East Capitol Streets, the Southwest waterfront, and the Anacostia River. By expanding the monumental core in this way, the

Capitol would truly become the center of the city with symbols of the Nation radiating out in all directions.

As a visionary for the next 50 to 100 years, we are proud that our Legacy Plan is already being successfully implemented. One of the most significant Legacy achievements to date is the 2001 Memorials and Museums Master Plan. Produced by NCPC, in partnership with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, the plan identifies 100 sites for future museums and memorials that are widely distributed to all quadrants of the city to enrich the economic, social, and cultural life of the Nation's capital.

Another milestone was reached in 2003 when, through your efforts, Chairman Thomas and the work of this subcommittee, Congress made into law one of the central policies of the Memorials and Museums Master Plan. You created the Reserve, comprising the great cross-axis of the Mall from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial where no new commemorative works or visitors would be located. This defined the Mall, which Congress acknowledged, as a substantially completed work of civic art.

NCPC's current work with the District of Columbia on a new vision for South Capitol Street has also been a major step forward for our Legacy Plan. Legacy established a vision for transforming South Capitol Street into a grand urban boulevard and waterfront gateway. On March 3 of this year, NCPC unveiled a detailed plan to implement that vision. The plan calls for development of an oval traffic rotary with a green park or common that will feature memorial or civic art where the new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge would intersect with South Capitol Street and Potomac Avenue. The green common and a new South Capitol waterfront park located between the rotary and the Anacostia River would create a major new commemorative area that will help relieve pressure on major memorials on the Mall.

We recognize that the Mall will continue to be a living landscape and symbol of our democracy that must be preserved. A new Mall master plan is a necessary tool to help preserve its historic landscape and manage its physical development. NCPC supports and encourages the National Park Service's requests for funds for such a master plan. NCPC's role as the Government's central planning agency would make us a necessary and willing partner with the National Park Service and others to undertake this planning effort.

We would also submit that there are others who are very helpful in this process, including the other government agencies and our friends in the community some of whom are with us today. We would also say that the Trust for the National Mall, which was established a few years ago, would be an instrumental part of this new constituency, this public-private partnership, similar to the Central Park Conservancy in New York City and the Golden Gate Park Conservancy in San Francisco. We believe with this constituency we can together form a team that will move forward the Legacy Plan.

We hope to continue with that as we go forward, and we look forward to your advice and guidance as we do that. We again appre-

ciate your invitation to be here today, and I would be happy to take your questions at the end of the testimony.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Cogbill follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN V. COGBILL, III, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Good afternoon, Chairman Thomas and Members of the Subcommittee. My name is John V. Cogbill, III. I am the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. NCPC was originally established by Congress in 1924 as the park planning agency for the national capital and has evolved into the federal government's central planning agency for the National Capital Region. I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak with you about the National Mall and NCPC's work throughout the years to establish a 21st-century vision for the National Capital Region and the National Mall. Like the other members of this panel, NCPC recognizes that there are continuing demands for commemorative, interpretive, and other uses of the historic and symbolic landscape that is the National Mall. We support the effort to complete a long-term master plan for the Mall. A Mall master plan would complement the visionary long-term planning for the expansion of Washington's monumental core outlined in NCPC's *Legacy Plan* (released in 1997) and the *Memorials and Museums Master Plan* (approved in 2001).

I. NCPC'S LEGACY PLAN IS THE VISION PLAN AND THE 21ST-CENTURY EXTENSION OF THE L'ENFANT AND MCMILLAN PLANS

NCPC's 1997 *Legacy Plan* is the long-term vision plan for the national capital. *Legacy* lays out a 50-100 year vision for the national capital and is the result of a multi-year effort launched in the early 1990s by NCPC in collaboration with all of the major federal landholding agencies, members of Congress, the public, civic groups, and preeminent architects, landscape architects, urban planners, historians, and other experts.

The *Legacy Plan* addresses the demand for ever-increasing memorial, museum, and other development on the Mall by calling for an expansion of the area we know as Washington's monumental core. The monumental core currently includes the Mall and the areas immediately beyond it, including the United States Capitol, the White House and President's Park, Pennsylvania Avenue and the Federal Triangle area, East and West Potomac Parks, the Southwest Federal Center, the Northwest Rectangle, Arlington Cemetery, and the Pentagon. The *Legacy Plan* would expand the monumental core beyond its current boundaries into other areas of Washington, such as South Capitol Street, parts of the Southwest Waterfront area (such as the 10th Street Overlook) and along the Anacostia River at East Capitol Street. It would provide new areas for memorials, museums, public recreation space, and other public building that would also enhance Washington's larger urban fabric and assist in the city's ongoing economic development.

The original L'Enfant Plan of 1791 set out Washington's original physical form based on the separation of powers and the use of grand axial avenues and streets to express our federal system of government. L'Enfant saw the area between the United States Capitol and the Washington Monument as a grand four-hundred-foot-wide ceremonial avenue to be lined with imposing houses and gardens as part of a "vast esplanade." In 1901, responding to the need to revive, refine, and extend the L'Enfant Plan's framework to manage growth in the national capital, Congress established the McMillan Commission to plan for improvements to the District of Columbia's park system. The McMillan Commission's plan for the Mall called for a reconfiguration and westward extension on newly filled land. Reinforcing L'Enfant's themes, the McMillan Commission further highlighted the relationship among the grand axial streets and avenues, and the groupings of major public buildings along the Mall, especially the Federal Triangle.

The *Legacy Plan* recognizes the Mall as a substantially completed work of civic art that must be preserved and maintained. Substantially complete does not mean unchanging. The Mall's completeness refers to the fact that its historic landscape, its defined visual and geographic form, its historic views, and its fixed iconic points—such as the Washington Monument and Lincoln and Jefferson memorials—comprise a whole that should not be overwhelmed by new monumental or commemorative buildings. Therefore, *Legacy* proposes expanding the monumental core beyond the Mall and the traditional center of Washington to North and South Capitol Streets, the Anacostia River, and adjacent areas. By expanding the monumental core in this way, the Capitol would truly become the center of the city, with symbols of the nation radiating out in all directions.

As a visionary plan for the next 50-100 years, the *Legacy Plan* serves as a basis for further planning in the years ahead. We are proud of the many facets of our *Legacy Plan* already being successfully implemented. One of the most significant Legacy proposals to come to fruition is the development of the agency's 2001 *Memorials and Museums Master Plan*. Produced in partnership with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, the plan identifies 100 sites for future memorials and museums that are widely distributed to enrich the economic, social, and cultural life of the nation's capital. We were heartened in 2003 when Congress, through your efforts, Chairman Thomas, and the work of this Committee, had the thoughtfulness and foresight to give the force of law to one of the central policies of the *Memorials and Museums Master Plan*. That policy and your ensuing legislation created a Reserve comprising the great cross-axis of the Mall from the United States Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and the White House to the Jefferson Memorial, where no new commemorative works or visitor centers would be located.

NCPC's recent work with the District of Columbia on a new vision for South Capitol Street has also been a major step forward in making the *Legacy Plan* a reality. Legacy established a vision for transforming South Capitol Street into a grand urban boulevard and waterfront gateway. On March 3, 2005, NCPC's South Capitol Street Task Force unveiled a more detailed plan for that vision. The Task Force plan calls for the development of an oval traffic rotary, with a green park or common that will feature a memorial or civic art, where the new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge would intersect with South Capitol Street and Potomac Avenue. The green common and a new South Capitol Waterfront Park located between the rotary and the Anacostia River would create a major new commemorative area that will help relieve pressure for memorials on the Mall, by providing opportunities for a combination of parkland, retail, residential, and cultural establishments, and additional sites for memorials and other commemorative works.

II. WHILE ADVANCING LEGACY'S VISION CAN RELIEVE MANY OF THE PRESSURES ON THE MALL, THERE IS STILL A NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE MALL MASTER PLAN

Legacy and we at NCPC recognize that the Mall will continue to be a living landscape and symbol of our democracy that must be preserved. A new Mall master plan would be a valuable tool in preserving its historic landscapes, managing its physical development, and improving its maintenance and services for visitors and residents alike. NCPC supports and encourages the National Park Service's requests for funds for such a master plan. NCPC's unique mission as the federal government's central planning agency and our breadth of planning, design, and preservation expertise makes us a natural, necessary, and willing partner with the National Park Service and others to undertake a master planning effort.

It should be made clear that the *Legacy Plan* is a vision plan that is not intended to address detailed or site-specific design and management concerns. To address these, a Mall master plan is needed to balance the Mall's physical and symbolic character with the demands of its many users. A master plan should define "areas of influence" for the Mall's major icons. It should include a land use plan and site-specific development plans to guide future additions, improvements, and other physical modifications to the Mall. It should address vehicular and pedestrian circulation, visitor facilities and services, public recreational uses, public celebrations and gatherings, physical security, and planning for temporary events.

A Mall master plan must also address calls for the "expansion" of the Mall's commemorative and museum uses into existing open spaces along the city's waterfront. While the *Legacy Plan*, *Memorials and Museums Master Plan*, and Commemorative Works Act encourage the expansion of the monumental core and the dispersion of memorials and museums into other areas of the city, this should not be done at the expense of the need to preserve and improve existing public open spaces that are already used for public recreation, cultural activities, gatherings, and celebrations. Most importantly, NCPC does not support any attempt to designate East Potomac Park as an area for major memorials and museums. While the *Memorials and Museums Master Plan* does include several sites in East Potomac Park as potential commemorative sites, its intention is to provide space for smaller commemorative works that enhance, not overwhelm, the predominantly waterfront open space and recreational character of East Potomac Park.

A successful Mall master plan would indeed be an important tool to assist the National Park Service in its stewardship of the Mall. It would also assist NCPC in our review of security and other projects on the Mall by putting those projects into a larger, more integrated, framework. A successful, inclusive, and well received master plan would also serve as a basis for re-establishing the Mall's identity as a na-

tional public space and serve as a roadmap for a public-private constituency, such as the Trust for the National Mall, that may act as a fundraising and preservation advocacy body similar to such groups as the Central Park Conservancy in New York City and the Presidio Trust in San Francisco. Federal government resources will always be limited and meeting the Mall's myriad needs will always be a challenge. A National Mall constituency could play a vital role in helping preserve the Mall well beyond the 21st century.

As the central planning agency for the federal community in the National Capital Region, we continue to be a willing and necessary partner in any effort to plan for the Mall. We would support and serve as enthusiastic participants in the development of a Mall master plan. We will also continue with our plans for South Capitol Street and elsewhere to expand Washington's monumental core to relieve pressure on the Mall and to enhance the nation's capital.

We appreciate your invitation to be here today and I am happy to take any questions.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, sir.
Mr. Childs.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID M. CHILDS, CHAIRMAN,
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS**

Mr. CHILDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In light of your statement that you will have to be going to a vote soon, would it be appropriate for me to summarize a couple of points and to insert, for your reading, our actual testimony we have written out?

Senator THOMAS. Your testimony will be in the record.

Mr. CHILDS. Thank you very much. Good afternoon and thank you for asking us to be here.

I am David Childs, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington, and I am also an architect and practiced here for a number of years. I began my career, in fact, working for Senator Moynihan on the plans for Pennsylvania Avenue and, in fact, the principal designer for my client, the Park Service, in 1972 of the last master plan of the Mall.

I think it is most relevant that today's subject be—I tell you that, in fact, the Fine Arts Commission was created because of a Senator's activity, Senator McMillan, which has been referred to several times today, and in 1910 those members of the McMillan Commission Plan were actually invited to become the Commission of Fine Arts to oversee the implementation of that plan. So we were born in an activity you have started again 100 years later, a similar one, and are delighted to be here and, of course, are centrally interested in the result.

We are very much in line with the testimony that you have heard here earlier by my colleagues, particularly of John Parsons and of John Cogbill, my colleague at the National Capital Planning Commission. We believe strongly that updated plans are good. Having done, as I say, this 1972 master plan for the bicentennial, this is 100 years since the Mall was looked at in a serious way and comprehensive way. And I would strong say that the Commission of Fine Arts would underscore that need for a great new plan to be commissioned.

I would suggest that be done in perhaps a number of fashions, either under the Congress' leadership, as you have said here, but I would strongly endorse not the extension of new bodies. Here we have repetition of overlapping jurisdictions in Washington, and we all know how that can slow things down. In fact, the Park Service,

my original client, on the 1972 plan is the largest agency for the largest area in this, and I believe their expertise should be used.

But it would be of great interest, I think, to use some of the greatest minds across the country, as was done in the McMillan Commission Plan, to come together and to advise either the Park Service, the administration, or yourselves in coming forth with a brilliant new plan that would be appropriate and involve many others in whatever review capacity should be done.

I also believe, as Mr. Cogbill has just told you, that the establishment of a nonprofit conservancy to help this stewardship—part of the real problem with the Mall is its maintenance. Authorization bills are relatively easy. It is the appropriations that is tough. I know that John Parsons—I have watched him. We have great plans already, but they are hard to implement and keep up.

So I would endorse what happened in my current city in which I live, New York. What happened in New York for the New York park system—the conservancy for Central Park is unbelievable if you have been up there and seen the transformation that has taken place with the help of that group.

One other point that I would add that is not in my testimony. This is a much larger Mall than people think. Yes, it has expanded and people's interpretation of the Mall is much larger than the technical end at 14th Street, but it goes beyond even that. It even goes beyond the Potomac River. I remember reading when I was young the statements by our Founding Fathers, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, about the importance of the great axial view that goes over to the hills in a true French baroque pattern to the green hills of now, of course, the National Cemetery. But there are discussions by the local jurisdictions to raise height limits in Rosslyn. So the Mall's influence, looking forward out to other places, as well as looking in, should be of consideration of this plan, and I believe of national interest.

So in summary, nothing is more important. The Capitol is at the center of the city. Its front door faces east, but people think of that area to the west as the imagery, the great icons, the greatest of all, the Washington Monument, as a symbol of our Nation and our culture. So nothing is more important, and we stand ready with my colleagues to my right to do whatever we can to help in this regard.

Thank you for asking us here today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Childs follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID M. CHILDS, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Good afternoon, Chairman Thomas and Members of the Subcommittee. My name is David Childs and I am the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission thanks you for the invitation to testify today and appreciates the opportunity to join your discussion on the management and planning issues for the National Mall.

The Commission of Fine Arts was created by an act of Congress in 1910 as a result of the planning efforts of the Senate Park Commission which was initiated by Senator James McMillan of Michigan at the turn of the 20th century. The Commission of Fine Arts has played an integral role in the creation and development of the National Mall as we know it today. Our ongoing mission is to provide design review of all new projects in the monumental core of the city and, most importantly, for the National Mall. As the principal agency for reviewing designs for public and private development in the Nation's Capital, the Commission provides advice and comment to Federal agencies, private individuals and organizations, and the District of Columbia government. Included in the Commission's responsibilities is the approval

of sites and designs for monuments and memorials under the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. The Commission has reviewed all design and construction on the Mall since 1910—most recently, the Museum of the American Indian and the security plans for the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, the Smithsonian Museums, and the Department of Agriculture. The Commission has been actively engaged in realizing the full potential of the Mall as the Nation's public ceremonial space as envisioned in the Senate Park Commission's McMillan Plan of 1902. The Commission works in cooperation with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) in the planning process for future development of the Mall and is supportive of the NCPC Legacy Plan. We continue to cultivate a cooperative relationship with the major stewards of the Mall, including the National Park Service and the Smithsonian Institution.

In our active role in reviewing new projects on the Mall, the Commission of Fine Arts is committed to developing stronger relationships with all public and private organizations having a vested interest in the Mall. More specifically, the Commission is working with Federal agencies to improve the design of security products to reduce their impact on the built environment and public space. To alleviate the pressure of additional construction on the Mall, we are also encouraging the continued development of museums and commemorative works in other areas of the city as recommended in the Memorials and Museums Master plan of 2001. In addition, we have encouraged ongoing discussions of a new master plan of the Mall to provide guidance for all stakeholders.

The Commission of Fine Arts strongly supports the development of an updated master plan for the Mall. The most recent master plan for National Park Service property on the Mall was last revised in 1972. We believe master planning is crucial to manage and preserve the existing landscape and open public space, as well as to guide future development. The Mall is a unique resource of national importance and must be maintained at the highest level of quality for future generations. Therefore, an up-to-date comprehensive master plan should be developed through an open public process that includes all stakeholders, review agencies, and interested parties.

The Commission of Fine Arts is one of the few agencies with jurisdiction over the entire Mall precinct and is dedicated to providing guidance on its buildings, monuments, and landscape. The Commission's unique mission enables the agency to guide discussions on the long-term vision for the Mall. The Commission of Fine Arts would not support the creation of an additional oversight body for the Mall as it would add redundancy given the Congressional mandates which already exist for the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the State Historic Preservation Office of the District of Columbia. Additional bureaucracy and potentially conflicting authorities could complicate communication between agencies, stakeholders, and other interested parties.

The Commission of Fine Arts supports the establishment of an independent, non-profit conservancy to enhance the stewardship of the Mall. It could be modeled after similar organizations established for New York City's Central Park or San Francisco's Golden Gate National Park. Through advocacy, fundraising, and the development of public-private partnerships, the conservancy could promote the preservation, management, and sustainability of the landscape without becoming an additional oversight design review body. We recognize that a similar organization, the Trust for the National Mall, has recently reached an agreement with the National Park Service to assist them with maintenance expenses.

The Commission of Fine Arts, since its creation as the primary agency for reviewing design in the Nation's Capital, has been committed to encouraging the highest quality of design for the development of the Mall as the Nation's premier civic space. We look forward to continuing our work with Congress, other agencies, and the public to achieve the strongest vision possible for the National Mall.

This concludes our written testimony. I would be happy to respond to any questions you might have.

Senator THOMAS. Well, thank you very much.

Senator Salazar, did you have a statement you would like to make or comments?

**STATEMENT OF HON. KEN SALAZAR, U.S. SENATOR
FROM COLORADO**

Senator SALAZAR. Chairman Thomas, if I may, just a quick comment.

The National Mall is, in fact, one of those very special places for all of us to visit. My father, who passed away 2 years ago and was one of my own personal heroes and who was part of the world's greatest generation as a veteran from World War II, would have been very proud to have had the opportunity to have come here today and to have visited the World War II Memorial. So I commend you on the work that you do for one of our great symbols of our freedom and democracy in this country.

I have a question for whoever wants to answer, but maybe Mr. Cogbill does. Mr. Cooper raised the possibility of developing a national conservancy to try to bring together all the stakeholders under one management entity to make sure that we are doing all those things that we ought to be doing to maintain the Mall and to make sure that we have a delineation of boundaries and the like. I think what he is talking about is very similar to what has happened in New York.

It frankly astounds me that with the long history that we have had in Washington and with this Mall that we have not done that yet, that we do not have an entity that essentially has that jurisdictional responsibility. In my own natural resources work of the past, I have often seen what happens when you end up having multiple jurisdictions, all of which have a piece of the pie. It does not seem that you really have the kind of coordination that you need. It seems to me that given the symbolism of the Mall and given the fact you have so many different competing interests, if you will, maybe not competing interests, but different jurisdictions involved, that that is an idea that would make absolute, eminent sense.

So I guess my question to you is why has it not happened if it seems to be such a sensible thing?

Mr. COGBILL. Thank you, sir, for the question.

First, as I mentioned at the beginning, the National Capital Planning Commission is the central planning agency for the Federal Government in the national capital. Part of our duties are to preserve the important historical and natural features of the national capital. So that role was really fulfilled or begun for this century with the Legacy Plan.

The Legacy Plan really understood at that point and contemplated the need to do something about the Mall. It really was a result of the establishment of the American Indian Museum. At that point, the National Capital Planning Commission realized that the Mall had really reached capacity and that we needed to go beyond that. So the Legacy Plan gave birth to that idea of expanding the monumental core, finding these additional places where memorials and museums could be located and identifying the 100 sites throughout the entire District of Columbia.

The second part of that would be that the National Park Service for the last 3 years has been working to try to prepare a Mall master plan, and we have been very supportive of their efforts to do that. We believe that will provide the public forum that will allow all—

Senator SALAZAR. Let me ask you this question, though, Mr. Cogbill, if I may. I take it then that you are in disagreement with Mr. Cooper's suggestion that what we do is to create a Mall conservancy organization that essentially has jurisdiction to define what the boundaries are for the Mall, as well as to engage in the planning.

Mr. COGBILL. Yes, sir.

Senator SALAZAR. So you would be opposed to Mr. Cooper's suggestion.

Mr. COGBILL. Yes, sir, and the reason for that is the Congress has already defined the Mall. That is something that we did in the Commemorative Works Act amendment in 2003. But more importantly, I think what happens is with this coming together of the master plan for the Mall, the implementation of the Legacy Plan, that we really have the opportunity to bring all these forces together to really, just as Mr. Childs said, hear the input from the public, receive the comments, and to the exact same thing without establishing another layer.

The difference I think between the McMillan Plan in 1910 and today is we have a completely different environment. We had a Federal city in 1910. Today we have a city that is made up of the Federal community, but as a partner in that is the District of Columbia, the people who live in the District of Columbia. So I think as part of this, what we would see is a more limited role and—

Senator SALAZAR. Let me just ask a question of Mr. Cooper because my time is almost up. From your point of view, you disagree with Mr. Cogbill. You believe that the National Capital Planning Commission is insufficient to carry out the kind of vision that you talked about with respect to the Mall. Tell us what the shortcomings are of the National Capital Planning Commission and how we ought to move forward.

Mr. COOPER. First of all, I think that my three colleagues here, each one heads a different organization, and each one has a role. They all are really taxed to the limit with the role that they are providing. I think NCPC is doing a fine job with the limited mandate that it really has. I know John continues to struggle for funds to do a lot of the things that he would otherwise like to do. And the Commission of Fine Arts at this point in time really struggles, I believe, because they are being asked to review projects and that have no real master planning foundation. In other words, they are getting piecemeal projects brought to them that do not have a master plan generically behind them.

So I think that what I am saying is that there are seven major stakeholders that have a part, that have a physical presence on the Mall. Right now there is no real means, no structured way, in which they coordinate together. I know there is ad hoc coordination going on, sometimes on particular projects, but there is not any long-term forum for planning for all of them to get together and plan and reflect on their needs. There is no overall plan for security of the Mall. There really is not a transportation plan. Each one of these things could really be rectified if there were some kind of a coordinating body that was put in place that really was dealing with both the Park Service areas, which really are the monuments and memorials, and the Smithsonian and increasingly the Capitol.

The Capitol now is a major tourist attraction and really needs to be taken into account as part of the National Mall.

Senator SALAZAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you.

Mr. PARSONS, how would you define the Mall?

Mr. PARSONS. It is pretty simple. The Mall extends from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial. It is 725 acres. 90 percent of that is under our jurisdiction.

Senator THOMAS. So as it is expanded in South Capitol and so on, that probably would not be the Mall. It would be called something else?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes. This is not anticipated to be a Federal enclave. That is, South Capitol Street, as you probably already know, will have the new baseball stadium on it. It will have private development along it. It is more like Pennsylvania Avenue, Connecticut Avenue, Massachusetts Avenue, but it would have its own identity, with a major park at the terminus at the Anacostia River. So it is a much different context to add to the Mall, if you will, as has been proposed.

Senator THOMAS. Obviously, we need to have some additional space, but it would be not necessarily on the Mall.

Mr. PARSONS. Correct. The master plan that Mr. Cogbill referred to has 100 sites. As you know, we are working with nine memorial proposals right now in the city, and we are finding sites for all of them outside of the Mall.

Senator THOMAS. I guess most of us sort of believe that the Park Service is pretty much the immediate manager of the Mall. Is that true?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, 90 percent of it, yes. We share that with the Smithsonian Institution who has eight museums, the National Gallery of Art who has two, the headquarters of the Department of Agriculture, and the local Department of Transportation, of course, has the streets that cross at grade.

Senator THOMAS. So if we were looking for some commission, they would be more to look at the future and make recommendations, not be a management tool. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, what we hope to do with our plan and will do is to engage all of these entities, as well as all of my colleagues here, including Mr. Cooper, in a major planning process over the next 3 years to address this 725-acre Mall.

Senator THOMAS. But I guess I am sort of trying to define a little between the management of what we have and the planning for what we are doing, and that would be a little different I think as it goes.

Mr. COOPER. May I inject something? Would it be appropriate?

Senator THOMAS. Sure.

Mr. COOPER. I think one of the problems—there is obviously a difference between planning and management policy. However, people that walk down the Mall do not really understand when they move from a Park Service piece of land onto the Smithsonian piece of land or onto the National Gallery piece of land. I think that at this point in time, there are policies that have an effect on the usefulness of the Mall to people that really stem from this fact

that if there were much more coordination, if there was integration, we would begin to see a lot of things happen that really cannot happen now because the Smithsonian is hamstrung on one side, the Park Service is hamstrung on another because they do not cross over. And I could go on.

Senator THOMAS. But you have to have kind of an entity that manages. You cannot have five or six different groups managing.

Mr. COOPER. I think each of the five or six groups is doing a good job, and we are not suggesting that any of them should not do the job they are doing. We are suggesting that they could do it a lot better if there was an organization that embodied them, that was really helping them to coordinate and pull things together. It would be more economic too.

Senator THOMAS. Well, I guess that is kind of what I was saying. As you plan, as you change, as you talk about the future, you need to have more groups involved. When you are actually managing it from day to day, then someone has to have that accountability and responsibility.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. In your plan here, Mr. Cooper, Third Century Mall, how many acres does that all encompass?

Mr. COOPER. You know, I am sorry I do not know. It is roughly doubling of the size the Mall.

Senator THOMAS. And it extends across the Potomac onto the Virginia side.

Mr. COOPER. Depending upon how much of that land you take into account, yes.

I am the architect of two major memorials on the Mall, and so I understand the fact that the developers of memorials really want to be on the Mall. One of the problems that John faces in the Memorial Commission all the time is the fact that everybody wants to be on the Mall, and there is no space. If you begin to see these memorials beginning to spread out in the city, that is not going to do the same thing. That is a real estate solution to the problem, not a cultural solution. There is a certain intensification of usage that has really got to go on in order for a memorial to be successful.

Senator THOMAS. There is concern about it being too intense I think, as a matter of fact.

Yes, Mr. Cogbill.

Mr. COGBILL. Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of points. Just as to the overall jurisdiction and planning for this, again I want to emphasize the role of the National Capital Planning Commission. In the area of security, this commission recently passed the Urban Design and Security Plan for all of the National Capital Region. It is actually being implemented outside of the National Capital Region. But in that, it specifically mandates what happens in the precinct that includes the Mall. So the security is being monitored on an overall basis by the National Capital Planning Commission.

As far as transportation, the Legacy Plan also contemplated transportation, and in fact we are now implementing the Circulator Plan which provides better tourist access, provides better resources for the business community, and provides the ability to move better

around the city in conjunction with the District of Columbia's Department of Transportation.

With the intensification, I think that is a very important point because there are a large number of open spaces and recreational areas in this particular part of Washington in what we call the Mall. What I would not want to see, if we were to expand this definition of the Mall, is to lose these open spaces, to lose these passive recreation areas, and lose the ability for the people who live and work here to enjoy that without having to walk over another memorial or monument.

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Childs, what is your idea about a future planning group and a management group?

Mr. CHILDS. Well, Senator, thank you. I feel very strongly that what we do not need is another overlaying agency. You will still have all of the different groups, including the community, that would be part of it, but I believe, as you were I think indicating, that the management role, the group that is most responsible for this large area has been the National Capital Planning Commission.

In the past, what they have done—I have been witness to that myself—is to include experts from around the world. They would not implement this plan themselves. They would have the very finest minds in art, architecture, landscape architecture be selected perhaps on a national competition or other means of selection to come and actually create that plan.

But I believe it would be a mistake as my colleagues, except for Mr. Cooper obviously. I feel that it should be done with the input of the existing plans and the management that is already in place.

But one does want to get the finest minds from across this Nation to come in and lend their authority by their reputation to add to the quality and the brilliance of the resultant design. So rather than just being a consensus idea that would come forward, it would be something like the McMillan Commission Plan of Daniel Burnham and Olmstead and McMillan and the great artists of the century as well to come together and do a plan which was really creative, thought about the city as a whole, rather than just the northwest or the southwest sections of the city, to create something with much larger impetus. That would be my recommendation. So I think that the three existing entities, the Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission, and mine, the Commission of Fine Arts, would be in unison, obviously, on that thought.

Senator THOMAS. I know this one will get me in trouble, but is there not a section here, the Mall and so on, which is basically national? It is Federal. It is not Washington, DC.

Mr. CHILDS. Exactly.

Senator THOMAS. That basic thing ought to be preserved as a Federal, national kind of thing.

Mr. CHILDS. Well, you know, it is interesting. I was actually sitting in Mr. Cogbill's seat when Gerald Ford, at the time of the Home Rule Act, created a new National Capital Planning Commission, of which I was chairman because it was separated from the new local planning agency under the Home Rule Act. And it was that very definition of what was the Federal interest. And the one thing that everyone would agree on is that the National Mall, as

generally understood and described by Mr. Parsons, was a Federal entity. So I would completely subscribe to that.

We at the Commission of Fine Arts look at many, many matters, including the coins that are issued in this country. We see as the central interest here of Federal interest is the National Mall. So I heartily underscore your thoughts that you have just said.

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Parsons.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, if there is something that you might want to consider, it would be establishing a national historical park, which you are quite familiar with all over the country. What is missing I think is that people perceive the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, World War II, Jefferson, the White House as pieces of something, but they are not sure what it is. And it is the National Mall. It is a term that is gaining national recognition but is really inside the Beltway, to use an old term. And possibly we might want to consider establishing a national historical park that encompasses all these.

Senator THOMAS. Encompasses all of it.

Mr. PARSONS. All of it and identifies it as an entity.

Senator THOMAS. One of the things we have run into—kind of a tough one—is T-shirt stands and concession trailers and things on the Mall. I understood that the Park Service was directed to find some alternative ways of doing that.

Mr. PARSONS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. First, I want to apologize for the tardiness in preparing the report that was in that 2003 Act. We very recently gave you an interim report on this, and I will just summarize it briefly, if that is okay.

You had asked about the concessions stands, food service facilities at the Lincoln Memorial, which are currently trailers, metal buildings, temporary, very unappealing. We have under construction now replacements for that, and there will be one on the north side of the Lincoln Memorial, one on the south. We are quite pleased with the design. It is similar to the ones that are placed already on the Mall in front of the museums.

Second, you had asked us about the stables, which were built in 1976, that lay between the Korean War Memorial and the DC War Memorial. We have looked at alternative sites. Given the parameters of the need for proximity to the White House with the horses, we have tentatively concluded that the best thing we can do is to remain where we are but not to have these temporary stables, in other words, to create something first class. But we have not coordinated this with our colleagues in the planning and fine arts commissions and that is why we cannot give you a full report.

Regarding the four demonstrations, if you will, that exist near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, these demonstrators have been there for 20 years, 24 hours a day. They are in compliance with the regulations that we have established for demonstrations of this kind. Without changing our regulations, which would impact many other activities that go on on the Mall, it will be very difficult to abolish them.

Due to construction that is going on at the Lincoln Memorial now, we intend to temporarily relocate them and will reassess that

when our construction is completed at the end of 2006. So we are committed to bringing back a full report to you.

Senator THOMAS. As we mentioned, part of this is to demonstrate our willingness for freedom of speech and so on. So that is a very important element of deciding.

As far as your stable is concerned, I think it is a good place for it. We had the privilege last Sunday of riding through the cherry blossoms, my wife and I and with the police. It was great. Your horses are a little bigger than ours are in Wyoming.

[Laughter.]

Senator THOMAS. But it was great and we liked it.

I sense that we all agree that there probably needs to be a group with an assignment to make a plan for the future. Is that right?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. COGBILL. Yes.

Mr. CHILDS. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. And would you very briefly, each of you, describe the composition of this group in your judgment?

Mr. CHILDS. Well, if I could also add one thing. I thought there was perhaps a bit of confusion earlier. The New York Conservancy for Central Park is a different kind of organizational group. It came in as a fund raising and design entity but does not take over any authority from the New York Parks Department. So the group that was referred to in other testimony here today that the Park Service has signed up with or another group could be that kind of a funding agency for maintenance and other provisions. It is not the kind of thing you are looking for, which is that larger body to come together to oversee the Mall plan itself.

Just to begin the answering of your central question, which I think is central to the discussions today, at the Commission of Fine Arts, we would be fearful about a new agency to come in to try to embrace all of the existing ones.

But we would support highly—and I only suggested the Park Service because they are the largest operator of the Mall, as we think of it today—of engaging minds, as I say, from around the country who are the finest thinkers in these acts of planning, design, art, and architecture, all of these matters that come together to create a plan, so that one could embrace a group of people, an advisory group, or a commission or other means of management, but to ensure that the finest minds come together to think about this matter and to report to you their findings, just as the McMillan Commission Plan did.

But I think that the central management of that would be logical to put within an agency that already has the manpower and all those things necessary to do it with the proper coordination not only of citizen groups like the coalition, but also of the existing regulatory bodies, such as the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

Senator THOMAS. Very well.

Very quickly, how do you envision it, Mr. Cogbill?

Mr. COGBILL. Mr. Chairman, I would adopt the comments of Mr. Childs, but I would also add that the National Capital Planning Commission has three Presidential appointees, two mayoral ap-

pointees, representatives of every major landholding entity within the Federal Government, as well as others from the District. In addition, as you have heard him say, we bring in experts from around the country, and we would look forward to partnering with the Park Service or whatever agency, including the Commission of Fine Arts and with Mr. Cooper and his organization, to develop the best possible plan.

Senator THOMAS. You have not officially started do that, though.

Mr. COGBILL. No, sir. We would work with the Park Service and certainly——

Senator THOMAS. I understand.

Mr. Cooper.

Mr. COOPER. The one thing that I am hearing that alarms me is that out of all the discussion here, the focus on the Mall as a people's place is taking on an entirely different character in the 20th century as the 20th century has moved along and is getting lost in the shuffle. I think that is the thing that we are most attuned to.

The organizational aspect of this of turf is not that critical to us. What is critical to us is trying to find a way to really get a set of policies and plans together that will, in effect, make it possible for the citizenry of the United States to be able to use the Mall more creatively. This a very important place. The more that usage gets restricted, whether it is by security or by lack of parking or by lack of amenities, the less we get the kind of infusion of the democratic spirit in the people who come to Washington in throngs than we could have. Right now, that is getting lost in the shuffle of kind of turf, and it should not be. Our plea is that whatever we do, we work out something that makes it possible to break the logjam of real estate versus use, public use.

Senator THOMAS. This is not an amusement park, is it?

Mr. COOPER. Not at all, no. But that does not mean there cannot be recreation or education, but there is an enormous amount of healing that goes on and the transmission of the democratic spirit. If you knock the Mall out, if you would limit it, then your constituents would really begin to feel that they lost something very important.

Senator THOMAS. I am sure.

Mr. COOPER. They depend on this being here. They depend on it being open.

Senator THOMAS. You do get sort of an historic, almost quiet feeling when you go buy the World War II monument, however. You are not out there cheering and throwing balloons up in the air as you watch that necessarily.

Mr. COOPER. No.

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Parsons.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with most of what has been said, and I would only add this to it. As you know, the Park Service is a proud steward of many, many parks throughout this country. You also know that we undertake planning for all of those parks. We see this as the same kind of undertaking, that is the delicate balance between recreation, celebration, demonstration, and that is what this has got to be about. How can we keep this as a sustainable landscape that we are all proud of at all times and allow all

of these things to occur in balance with one another? We feel we are the best agency to do that. The difference between this and Grand Canyon or Yellowstone is we have the other two Federal agencies to assist us in the decisionmaking, that is, the Commission of Fine Arts and the Planning Commission.

Senator THOMAS. Gentlemen, I thank you. We have started our vote over there, so I suppose voting interferes with our lives a lot around here. I do appreciate it.

I also think as we go along, obviously there are important things that people bring up they would like to celebrate. They want memorials for them. Unless we have a future plan where they can go somewhere else, we are going to have constant battles about what we are doing with the original Mall.

So I appreciate very much your being here and look forward to working with you and see if we can move forward. So thank you very much. I appreciate it.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:33 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

NATIONAL MALL THIRD CENTURY INITIATIVE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Re: Oversight Hearing on the National Mall

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: We appreciate this opportunity to answer your questions about the National Mall and its management in greater depth than was possible during the hearing.

Prepared by,

W. KENT COOPER, FAIA,
Coordinator.

[Enclosure.]

Question 1. How many acres are added by the Third Century Mall proposal?
Answer.

1.1 Major areas

East Potomac Park—368 acres +/-
West Potomac Park—64 acres +/-
Kennedy Center extension—16 acres +/-
Banneker overlook—9 acres +/-

Note: Acreage listed is calculated from NCPC maps

1.2 Corridors

South Capitol St. 7200 If—landscaped Boulevard. DC Redevelopment program
M Street SW 3400 If—existing DC street from S. Capitol St. to the Washington Channel.

L'Enfant promenade 1800 If—existing DC street extending from Independence Ave, SW to the Banneker overlook.

Washington Channel Bridge 1000 If—New construction. Could have memorial quality.

Question 2. How many new memorials and museums do you think that the existing Mall can accommodate and how many additional memorials would the Third Century Mall accommodate?

Answer.

2.1 The Existing Mall

17 projects.

The Moratorium legislated in the amendment to the Commemorative Works Act prohibits the construction of new memorials and visitors centers in the "Reserve" area with the exception of the MLK Memorial, the Black Patriots Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Visitors Center.

On the other hand, The NCPC Memorials and Museums Master Plan of 20

In addition this report identifies additional sites in Area One:

West Potomac Park—1
North of Constitution—4
South of Independence—2

2.2 Third Century Mall—sites outside Area One

31 memorial sites including sites for two major museums.

The NCPC Memorials and Museums Master Plan identifies the following memorial and museum sites in areas which are included in the Third Century Mall proposal:

- East Potomac Park—7
- South Capitol Street—5
- Banneker Overlook—3
- Kennedy Center area—10
- Virginia side of the River—6

2.3 Third Century Mall—New sites not identified in the Memorials and Museums Master Plan

20 memorial sites including two major museum sites.

In addition, a mega-event open space is included.

- West Potomac Park—3
- East Potomac Park—12
- M Street corridor—1
- Virginia side of River—4

2.4 Summary

The existing Mall (Reserve and Area 1) has documented sites suitable for up to 17 additional memorial projects. The search for a suitable site for the African-American Museum has shown that none of these sites are really ideal for a major museum.

The Third Century Mall, as proposed, is suitable for at least 51 new memorial projects including 4 major museums. In addition, a mega-events open space is planned.

It should be pointed out that the sites listed in the NCPC Memorials and Museums Master Plan Report were developed on the basis of being open real estate. In contrast, the memorial and museum sites listed in the Third Century Mall are located in thematic zones in which a suitable cultural context for a variety of memorial topics can be properly developed. The intent is to develop a strong symbolic setting. The Third Century Mall will be different than the Beaux Arts setting of the existing Mall, but will develop a similar symbolic power, rooted in the spirit of our democracy.

Question 3. How would you define the Mall?

Answer. The Mall is both a “place” and an “idea”. The “place” has grown over the years, as our nation has grown. The Congressional Budget office says that today there isn’t an agreed definition of what constitutes “The Mall”.

The “idea”, while still strongly rooted in the founding principles of our democracy, has also grown—evolved—as the public has learned its value as the nation’s premier place for celebration, recreation, demonstration and healing. Decades ago, Charles Moore, secretary of the McMillan Commission, observed that one can read the nation’s history in the monuments of the Mall. Today, that history is written not only in stone but in the public events which still echo in our nation’s collective heart and mind: The spirit of what it means to be an American.

Thus, we would define the Mall as the public open space which is anchored and framed by that dense network of monuments, memorials, museums, agencies and institutions which are co-located in and around the original L’Enfant geometric armature and which collectively reflect the founding principles of our nation’s Constitution, each contributing to our understanding of democracy and nationhood. As our nation grows and evolves, so will this network.

Question 4. Which organizations have jurisdiction over the Mall and what is the role of each?

Stakeholders—physical presence on the Mall

National Park Service—manages and maintains the major monuments and memorials on the Mall, the majority of the open spaces between Constitution and Independence Avenues from 3rd St. west, and both East and West Potomac Parks. While others, such as the American Battle Monuments Commission, and VVMF design and construct, NPS assumes ultimate responsibility for operation.

Manages most concessions in the public open spaces: food, gifts, and transportation on the Mall.

National Gallery of Art—manages, designs and maintains the NGA West and East Buildings, and their immediate surroundings, as well as the NGA Sculpture Garden.

Smithsonian Institution—manages, designs and maintains the nine Smithsonian Museums which are located on the Mall, and their immediate surroundings. Each of these museums enjoys a good deal of operational autonomy. The Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage plans and operates the annual Folklife Festival in the NPS managed open space.

Architect of the Capitol—manages, designs, and maintains the Capitol Building and its grounds, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, and the Botanical Gardens, both enclosed and open air.

General Services Administration—manages, designs and maintains the Department of Agriculture Headquarters Building and its surroundings. If the Mall is defined as in the McMillan Plan, and includes the Federal Triangle, including the Archives, White House etc., as well as areas south of Independence Avenue, then GSA's stake in the Mall is greatly enlarged.

District of Columbia—manages, designs and maintains the through streets and tunnels which traverse the Mall and provides utility service

Review agencies

National Capital Planning Commission—reviews and approves all projects to be constructed on the Mall. Prepares planning and design studies such as the Legacy Plan; maintains an archive of base drawings of the Mall

Commission of Fine Arts—advises on the design of all projects brought before it to be constructed on the Mall; maintains an archive of past projects and plans.

National Capital Memorial Commission—develops procedures for selecting memorial and museum sites, as well as design review and approval.

Congressional Oversight Committees—both the House and the Senate maintain a number of committees and subcommittees which focus on appropriations and operations. We do not have a comprehensive map of this oversight.

Question 5. Is there a compelling need for a comprehensive planning effort to provide vision for the National Mall as it enters its third century?

Answer. Two factors seem to mandate a major new planning effort.

First, the McMillan Mall is filled. Congress recognized this condition and declared a Moratorium on further memorial, museum and visitor center construction. This is a fragile condition. Three exceptions have already been made, and NPS has found a way around the moratorium by saying that privately funded projects are exempt. The logical answer to this condition is to create new appropriate sites for memorials by expanding the Mall as was done in 1901 by the McMillan Commission. Space is available to do this, but a comprehensive, visionary, plan for shaping this space is also needed as was the case in 1901.

During the recent Senate hearing, there was considerable focus placed on the fact that the NCPC Legacy "Framework" Plan of 1997 provides that necessary vision. We believe that many elements of this plan are very useful and should be incorporated into any new plan, but that the Legacy Plan stops short of providing an adequate vision for the 21st Century. It is an incomplete concept. (See below)

Likewise, during the recent Senate hearing, the NCPC Memorials and Museums Master Plan was cited as providing an adequate number of new memorial and museum sites to fill the needs of the new century. This plan was based on identifying available real estate throughout the city. It did not take into account the fact that meaningful memorials and museums are highly dependent on being located in relevant cultural contexts. A Local example of this problem was the sprinkling of Civil War Generals on horses throughout the city late in the nineteenth century. These certainly are artful orienting devices, but fail as true memorials. We need a visionary plan which attempts to provide flexible, relevant, context for many future memorial and museum projects.

Second, the role of the Mall in our society has gradually shifted throughout the last century. While the Mall's unique role remains rooted in interpreting the founding principles of our Democracy, today the Mall has become the premier national open space for celebration, recreation, demonstration, and healing—truly a people's place. This change in the character of Public Use now requires us to look at the existing Mall—as well as expansion areas—in a different light. The present-day Mall does not adequately support public use.

Basic visitor amenities are few and far between: toilets, food, shelter, lighting, benches, transportation, access and parking, things to do other than visit memorials and museums. Until this year no one has thought to prepare an orienting brochure about the Mall itself.

The Mall needs modern orientation systems and at least one well equipped Visitors Center. Largely due to its fractured management these needs are not being met. The Mall is truly an orphan.

The Mall needs a parent who is dedicated to making it into a world-class visitor experience. Creating a visionary plan is the first step. Creating an entity which is dedicated to keeping the Mall functioning is the second.

We need both.

The Moratorium has given us a short hiatus during which we can stop building and carefully consider a vision for the National Mall which is large enough to express our continuing commitment to the founding ideals of our Democracy and to guide us in shaping our evolving cultural identity. We must not let this rare opportunity be lost in bureaucratic indecision. Indeed, there is a compelling need for greatness.

U.S. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to respond formally to some of the questions raised at the Senate hearing on April 12, 2005. As the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, I applaud your efforts and concerns regarding the future of the National Mall.

Thank you again for giving the Commission of Fine Arts the opportunity to join in your discussion on the management and planning issues for the National Mall. I look forward to cooperating closely with your staff to make the most of what is an auspicious moment in the planning of the National Capital.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. CHILDS,
Chairman.

[Enclosure.]

Question 1. How would you define the Mall?

Answer. The National Mall has evolved from its earliest depiction on the L'Enfant Plan as a wide mile-long public space extending westward from the Capitol. Currently, there is a technical definition used by the primary agency responsible for managing the land, the National Park Service, which states that the National Mall lies between 3rd and 14th Streets to the east and west and between Constitution and Independence Avenues to the north and south. Practically speaking, the public perception of what is known as "the Mall" would likely include a rectangular area from the base of the Capitol grounds on the east to the Lincoln Memorial on the west and defined along its length by Constitution and Independence Avenues. However, it is important that we understand that there is a Federal interest in protecting the context of the Mall and the monumental core to include, for example, the green hills of the Arlington ridge which provides a visual backdrop to the entire composition of this national public space.

Question 2. Do you see expansion as an option for providing additional space for future monuments, memorials, and museums on the Mall? If so, in which direction should the expansion occur and what is currently located in that space?

Answer. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the monumental core of Washington was physically expanded through the reclamation of land out of what had been tidal mud flats along the Potomac, resulting in what we know today as an extension of the original Mall as well as East and West Potomac Parks. Today, there is no possibility of literally creating new land to enlarge the Mall although it is conceivable to widen the definition of "the Mall" to include other parts of the City's monumental core and parkland. The fact remains that such a definition change cannot create new sites for monuments, memorials, or museums that do not already exist in locations currently considered not on the Mall. Again, what is publicly perceived as the Mall will likely continue to be a discrete rectangular greensward running from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial regardless of what nomenclature is applied to the adjacent park areas.

However, there are other areas that can potentially be improved to provide prime locations for monuments, memorials, and museums within close proximity to the monumental core. As identified in the Legacy Plan and the 2001 Memorials and Museums Master Plan, areas radiating out from the center of the city at the U. S. Capitol—such as South Capitol Street—could be developed as an enlargement of the commemorative space we now think of as occurring on the National Mall.

Question 3. Which organizations have jurisdiction over the Mall and what is the role of each?

Answer. There are two kinds of organizations that have jurisdiction over the Mall: those who manage or occupy the land and those who have design, preservation, or planning oversight for the land. The first group includes the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior; the Smithsonian Institution; the National Gallery of Art; the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the Architect of the Capitol; and the General Services Administration. The second group consists of our design review agency, the U. S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA); the Federal planning agency, the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC); the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Office. In addition, the District of Columbia Department of Transportation has authority over the north-south streets whereas the east-west avenues fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Highways Administration and the National Park Service. Of the land management group, the National Park Service is by far the largest controller of National Mall property and, because of the extent of its oversight, has a considerable role in the overall planning of the Mall.

Question 4. Is there a compelling need for compressive planning effort to provide vision for the National Mall as it enters its third century?

Answer. The Commission of Fine Arts, which was created to oversee the implementation of the McMillan Commission Plan, strongly supports updating plans for the Mall. The most recent master plan for the Mall was last revised in 1972 and since that time, the built landscape of the Mall and its environs has evolved considerably. In addition, there continues to be strong pressure to locate sites for memorials, monuments, and museums on the Mall that must be evaluated in a comprehensive way instead of being considered as piecemeal additions to the existing plan. Following on the achievements of L'Enfant and the McMillan Commission, we have a timely opportunity to bring a fresh vision to the National Mall as it enters its third century.

Question 5. Do you think a commission similar to the McMillan Commission should be established to plan for the third century of the National Mall? If so, who should be members of the commission and how much time should they be given to produce a report?

Answer. There are various ways to provide oversight for a new plan for the National Mall but every alternative should involve bringing the very best minds in the country to participate in what must be the creation of a brilliant new plan. A hundred years ago, the McMillan Commission was comprised of four design professionals of the highest national reputation who produced a visionary plan for Washington's monumental core. The process took about two years. While the Commission of Fine Arts is concerned about the creation of a new oversight agency, an ad hoc commission charged with the specific goal of preparing a bold plan for the National Mall could be similarly constituted with a group of independent professionals with representation from the existing design and planning oversight agencies, the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission. To ensure participation from the stakeholders and the public, this new commission would need to work with an advisory committee representing the various Federal land managers, national and local governments, and the general public. The National Park Service, as the largest of these stewards of National Mall property, would naturally have a central role in advising and administering the planning process.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: It is my pleasure to enclose our responses to the list of questions you provided as follow-up to the April 12, 2005 hearing before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources regarding the National Mall.

The National Capital Planning Commission looks forward to working with you and the Subcommittee on National Parks and to partnering with the National Park Service, the Commission of Fine Arts, the general public, and with design and planning professionals from around the country in planning for the future use of this treasured open space.

If we can provide any other information, please call me or our Executive Director, Patricia Gallagher, at 202-482-7228.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. COGBILL, III,
Chairman.

[Enclosures.]

Question 1. How would you define the Mall?

Answer. The National Capital Planning Commission defines the National Mall as the area from the United States Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial (see attached NCPC rendering).

Question 2. Which organizations have jurisdiction over the Mall and what is the role of each?

Answer. The National Park Service has primary jurisdiction over the National Mall and provides overall management for much of this great open space. Planning guidance and approval for new and existing projects on the Mall is provided by NCPC—the central federal planning agency for the National Capital Region—and CFA, the federal design review agency. Other agencies with jurisdiction of facilities around the Mall include the Architect of the Capitol, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, the Department of Agriculture, the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (north-south streets), and the Federal Highways Administration (east-west streets).

Question 3. Is there a compelling need for a comprehensive planning effort to provide vision for the National Mall as it enters its third century?

Answer. Yes. The last significant master plan for the Mall was completed in 1972. In the more than 30 years that have since passed, the Mall has changed greatly due to the addition of many new major memorials and museums. As more groups and individuals continue to seek a claim to the Mall, it is critical that federal planners balance the many competing demands for recreation, tourism, commemoration, public events, and open space.

A new Mall Master Plan would provide a basis for preserving what is important about this great open space—its public uses, historic scope, iconic image, and its beauty. The master plan should include areas adjacent to the Mall and it should identify additional areas that could be linked to the Mall along prominent, monumental streets. NCPC's *Memorials and Museums Master Plan*, adopted in 2001, identifies many opportunities for expanding the important symbolic spaces and activities of the Mall. These include linkages along 10th Street to the Banneker Overlook at the Potomac River waterfront, South Capitol Street to the Anacostia waterfront, and East Capitol Street to Anacostia Park and the waterfront.

A new Mall Master Plan should also address the increasing use of security measures at our national icons. A portion of the plan should contain elements similar to the ones identified in NCPC's *National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan* that was adopted in 2002, to integrate security requirements into the Mall's historic fabric.

The Mall Master Plan should be a collaborative effort. This important initiative would include the principal planning, review and management authorities in the nation's capital—NCPC, CFA and NPS.

These agencies should seek the counsel of the nation's leading designers, historians, and artists and should include input from key stakeholders and public groups, such as the National Coalition to Save the Mall.

Question 4. At the close of the last century the National Capital Planning Commission produced, "Extending the Legacy," as a framework of planning and urban design for all of Washington, DC. The National Mall is the core of the Nation's Capital. Is there further action needed by the Subcommittee on National Parks to encourage the framework to become a reality?

Answer. Yes. Subcommittee members could encourage their colleagues to support funding for the planning and development of new sites to accommodate future national memorials and museums, as proposed in NCPC's *Extending the Legacy*. These new spaces must be desirable locations in their own right and could include areas along the axes of the U.S. Capitol, such as the terminus of South Capitol Street at the Anacostia River waterfront and the Banneker Overlook on 10th Street SW. Further, the Subcommittee can help protect the limited remaining space on the Mall by directing memorial sponsors to consider one of the 100 potential sites that have already been identified by NCPC in the *Memorials and Museums Master Plan*.

Question 5. What was the genesis of the Legacy Plan referred to in your testimony? Who suggested that it be conducted? How was it funded? How long did it take to complete? What will it take to have it implemented in its entirety?

Answer. *Extending the Legacy* is the third chapter in Washington's planning history following the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans before it. Legacy looks ahead 50-100 years and offers a framework for future development. The plan recenters Washington on the U.S. Capitol and extends development to the four quadrants of the city. Preserving and enhancing the open space of the National Mall is the cornerstone of the plan.

The Legacy initiative began in 1991 in response to the proliferation of new museums and memorials on the Mall in the 1980s. The plan was funded by federal budget appropriations to NCPC, which worked with a team of prominent architects, urban designers, economists, transportation planners, and the general public. NCPC published the plan in 1997. Legacy expanded the definition of "federal interest" to include adjacent neighborhoods, waterfronts, parks, and gateways.

We are pleased that a number of Legacy proposals have received funding in recent years and are now being implemented. Legacy's proposal for a new transit system—the Downtown Circulator—will be realized this summer when the first routes begin service; plans have been advanced to create an exciting public plaza in front of the Kennedy Center and remove the tangle of freeway ramps that separate it from the surrounding neighborhood; funding has been recently awarded to study the possibility of relocating rail tracks in the Monumental Core; and initial funding has been awarded to begin implementing Legacy's vision to transform South Street into a grand urban boulevard.

NCPC looks forward to the continued support of the Subcommittee as it works to further the important initiatives unveiled in Legacy. Much remains to be done.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed are the responses to the follow-up questions from the Oversight Hearing on the National Mall held by the Subcommittee on National Parks on April 12, 2005. The National Park Service has prepared these responses.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Legislative and Congressional Affairs.

Sincerely,

JANE M. LYDER,
Legislative Counsel.

[Enclosures.]

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR THOMAS

Question 1. How would you define the Mall?

Answer. Generally, the National Mall encompasses the area east/west from the Capitol Grounds to the Lincoln Memorial and north/south from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial. As a result of the Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2004, this description is now referenced in the Commemorative Works Act provision which defines the Reserve, in 40 U.S.C.A. Section 8902(a)(3). Previously, in defining the Mall, the NPS also has referenced the National Capital Planning Commission's (NCPC) definition that the Mall is the area bounded on the north by Constitution Avenue, NW, on the south by Independence Avenue, NW, by the Capitol on the east, and 14th Street on the west, prior to reaching the Washington Monument.

Question 2. Which organizations have jurisdiction over the Mall and what is the role of each?

Answer. The National Park Service (NPS) manages 90% of the 725-acre National Mall. The remaining 10% is managed by the Smithsonian Institution, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Gallery of Art with whom we consult regularly. The District of Columbia has jurisdiction over 3rd, 4th, 7th, and 14th Streets, and the NPS has jurisdiction over 15th, 17th, and 23rd Streets as well as Constitution and Independence Avenues from the Lincoln Memorial to 14th Street.

The agencies with review and/or approval authority over projects proposed for placement on the National Mall other than the National Park Service and, in the context of commemorative works, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, are the Commission of Fine Arts, the NCPC, the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Question 3. Is there a compelling need for a comprehensive planning effort to provide vision for the National Mall as it enters its third century?

Answer. In 1990, the NCPC initiated a new public planning process for the city's urban core. This framework plan was completed in 1997 to guide long-term growth and is called "Extending the Legacy," as it is based on the legacy of the two landmark plans, the L'Enfant Plan and the McMillan Plan. The Legacy Plan protects the integrity of the National Mall as we know it today. By establishing the Capitol as the axis for new growth which will occur along North, South, and East Capitol Streets, commemorative works and museums can now be directed to new ceremonial sites located outside the National Mall. The Legacy Plan was built upon and succeeds the McMillan Plan with a vision for the 21st Century. On November 17, 2003, Congress declared the National Mall complete by establishing the Reserve through an amendment to the Commemorative Works Act. With the creation of the Reserve under Public Law 108-126, we believe the National Mall is a completed work of civic art and that there is no need to expand or extend the National Mall into other areas of the city or into East Potomac Park.

South Capitol Street is undergoing a transition that has the promise of transforming it into a major boulevard in Washington, DC. In our judgment, South Capitol Street should not be added to the National Mall, but should be developed to have its own unique identity. It should not be a Federal enclave, but instead, should include a mix of uses, including sites for commemorative works and museums like Pennsylvania Avenue has between the Capitol and the White House. Without managing the streetscape, NPS could manage any future national memorials located on South Capitol Street. If a new commemorative work is located on privately-owned property, NPS management could be accomplished by the United States acquiring the property as parkland to be administered by the NPS, before or after the commemorative work is completed, or, if the new memorial is located on government property, jurisdiction could similarly be transferred to the NPS. Examples of the latter include the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, the Francis Scott Key Memorial, and the African American Civil War Memorial.

We also do not believe that the National Mall should be expanded to include East Potomac Park. This concept, proposed by the National Coalition to Save Our Mall, was thoroughly debated during the formulation of the Legacy Plan. The consensus was that this area should remain primarily as a recreational park, although the Memorials and Museums Master Plan, which was developed pursuant to the Legacy Plan, proposed the southern tip of the park as a site for a major memorial, and sites for smaller memorials along its perimeter. Additionally, recent amendments to the Commemorative Works Act specifically preclude museums from being located within East Potomac Park.

While we do not believe there is a need to expand or extend the National Mall, the NPS does recognize the need for a single comprehensive plan to provide guidance for NPS management of the National Mall and, in particular, to address concerns related to the extremely high levels of use and resulting impacts to the landscape. The NPS has begun a public planning process that would result in the National Mall Comprehensive Management Plan. We are committed to ensuring that the planning process is open and inclusive and engages NCPC, Commission of Fine Arts, our partners, interested stakeholders, and the American public in this important effort to preserve existing landmark plans by planning for future use.

Question 4. The National Park Service has closed or severely restricted parking near the Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial. Why was this done, is it temporary, and what alternatives do you have for the public to park and tour the memorials? Can you at least provide parking for handicapped individuals?

Answer. Within walking distance (500 yards) of the Washington Monument, there currently exists approximately 2,000 parking spaces along Constitution Avenue, Madison and Jefferson Drives, and in the parking lot at the Tidal Basin. The parking lot on the north side of the Washington Monument grounds, which was never designated as just for monument visitors, contained 108 spaces. It was constructed in the vista between the White House and the Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial to serve World War II temporary buildings. Those buildings were demolished in the 1960s. Removal of the parking lot increases the amount of open space used for a variety of recreational and festival activities and allows the completion of the long-planned German-American Friendship Garden. The removal of this parking lot was approved through a public planning process by the Commission of Fine Arts, the NCPC, the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as part of the 1993 Development Concept Plan.

The Jefferson Memorial has limited handicap parking located adjacent to the site, limited public parking spaces located 350 yards away, and two public parking lots

less than 600 yards ($\frac{1}{3}$ mile) from the Memorial. There also is a bus pick-up and drop-off area adjacent to the Memorial. The parking lot next to the Jefferson Memorial itself had to be closed because it is located within the required vehicular security perimeter as defined by site-specific security analyses.

Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton encouraged NPS to provide alternatives for visitors to use to access the Memorial. One alternative the NPS developed is presently in place. It is a 60-day trial expansion of Tourmobile's service so as to provide visitors the option to board the Tourmobile, for a modest fee, at the new Jefferson Memorial Parking lots and disembark at the Tourmobile stop at the Memorial. Tourmobile is the NPS concessioner providing visitor transportation. These shuttles are available daily between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., every 15 minutes. If the visitor chooses to continue on the normal Tourmobile route, the fee for the shuttle is credited towards the price of the Tourmobile tour. NPS and Tourmobile will evaluate this expansion of service at the end of the trial period to determine whether it should continue. The existing tour bus pickup and drop-off areas that are currently used by more than one-third of the visitors to this site will continue. Other possible additions may include a handicapped and limited parking outside the vehicular barrier perimeter and a passenger drop-off area.

Question 5. Section 206 of Public Law 108-126 directed the Secretary of the Interior to produce a report to relocate, as soon as practicable, the National Park Service's stable and maintenance facility located within the Reserve Area. What is the status of the effort and where will the stables and maintenance facility be located?

Answer. Through a March 14, 2005 letter to the subcommittee, the NPS provided an interim report, and the NPS expects to provide a final report to the subcommittee in July 2005.

First, concerning the stable, which is a U.S. Park Police facility, the NPS has developed criteria for siting such a facility. A key criterion is that this facility be located close to the Mall and its memorials and to the White House complex so as to allow for immediate response by USPP horse-mounted officers. Through its review, the NPS has concluded that the existing site, which is adjacent to Independence Avenue, best satisfies the criteria.

With regard to the maintenance facility, we believe this is referring to the concession facility as there is no maintenance facility on the Lincoln Memorial grounds within the Reserve. The current concession facility will be demolished this year and replaced with a structure similar to the facility in front of the Smithsonian museums.

Congress also directed the NPS to make other changes, if appropriate, to protect the character of the Reserve. Pursuant to this directive, the NPS is embarking on a Comprehensive Management Plan for the National Mall. We are currently developing the process we will use to develop this Plan. In creating this Plan, the NPS expects to work closely with the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer, the Commission of Fine Arts, the NCPC, and the public. The Plan may result in proposals for further legislation to protect the character of the Reserve.

We anticipate sending a final report to the Committee on these matters by July 2005.

Question 6. The same law also directed the Secretary to find an alternative to the T-shirt stands and concessions trailer that operate near the Lincoln Memorial. What plans do you have for removing the unsightly structures and when do you expect to have it done?

Answer. The current Lincoln Memorial concession program is being operated from a temporary structure. This is slated for demolition this year and will be replaced with a facility based on the design used on the National Mall in front of the Smithsonian museums. An identical facility will also be constructed on the island of land enclosed by Bacon Drive, Constitution Avenue, 23rd Street, and Lincoln Circle. These facilities have received approval from the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer, the Commission of Fine Arts and the NCPC. Work has already begun on the north kiosk and should be completed by this winter. Work on the south kiosk will start upon completion of the north kiosk and take 8 months to complete.

Regarding the First Amendment vigil sites on the Lincoln Memorial grounds, the Department of the Interior's Solicitor's Office has reviewed and litigated the issue intensively for many years. The outcome of this litigation (1) allows structures for message symbolism and as shelter for displays, (2) requires NPS to uniformly and even-handedly enforce regulations, and (3) limits sales items and dimensions of sales sites.

If regulations were modified or issued to expand the current restricted area at the Lincoln Memorial or the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the changes would preclude not only any vigil site activities but also hundreds of other traditional events and

demonstrations that regularly occur there such as fairs, festivals, high school band concerts, religious services, and other demonstrations. Indeed, an extended restricted zone would have precluded the 1963 March on Washington, the 2000 Millennium Celebration, or the long-standing Easter Sunrise services. In weighing the creation of any restricted area, the NPS must carefully consider the need to preserve “an atmosphere of calm, tranquility, and reverence” within the memorials but also whether it is “an unreasonable limitation on First Amendment activity.”

During the time that construction on the Lincoln Memorial Circle Security and Road Rehabilitation project moves into the area containing the current demonstration vigil sites, no permits will be issued for the area, and any demonstrators wishing to continue their activities will be relocated to other permit areas. Once construction has been completed, we will have a better idea whether applicants will request to use the earlier sites. If such applications are received, however, consistent with NPS regulations, we will then determine anew whether such activity is appropriate in the newly constructed and rehabilitated area.

Question 7. The George Mason Memorial, which is located in East Potomac Park near the Jefferson Memorial, was dedicated on April 9, 2002. The National Park Service has not added the memorial to any signs in the area to inform visitors of its existence and location. When do you plan to add the memorial to signs?

Answer. The NPS has designed wayside signs for the George Mason Memorial to be installed this fall. The location of the George Mason Memorial also is included in visitor directional signs throughout the National Mall. We are evaluating additional directional signage in the vicinity of this memorial. In addition, the NPS website contains a webpage solely devoted to the George Mason Memorial. This webpage contains information to aid visitors in planning their visit to this site.

Question 8. I’ve noticed on my drive into work early in the morning that some of the memorials occasionally have no lights or only some of the lights working. This seems to be the case for weeks at a time. What is your procedure for monitoring the lights and making repairs, and how long does it generally take to perform routine maintenance like changing light bulbs?

Answer. NPS inspects the lighting on all memorials on a regular rotation. All of the crews and rangers also are directed to report lighting problems between inspections, and we urge the public to notify us of any problems so that we can address them as quickly as possible. We should note, however, that the current condition of the lighting systems at our major icon memorials is less than satisfactory. We are in the process of replacing the systems at Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument and are fine tuning the new system at the Jefferson Memorial. The current construction at the Lincoln Memorial includes replacement of the 1950’s era lighting system for the interior and exterior of the Memorial. We anticipate the re-lighting work will be completed this summer. Additionally, the construction underway on the Lincoln Circle roads includes repair and replacement of the street lighting system around the Memorial, which corrects problems with PEPCO electrical service lines. In the interim, the NPS has provided supplemental temporary lighting to ensure visitor safety.

The Security and Grounds Improvement Project currently under construction at the Washington Monument includes redesign and replacement of the 1950’s era exterior lighting system. This work required demolition and removal of four hydraulic lift vaults, which provided illumination of the Monument between 100 and 500 feet. The new design allows the Monument to be illuminated from pedestal-mounted fixtures instead of in-ground vaults, which improves energy efficiency and sustainability. These design improvements were made possible by a partnership between the NPS, the National Park Foundation and Musco Lighting, Inc. Work will be completed early this summer.

The 2001 re-design and re-lighting of the Jefferson Memorial through a partnership with Osram-Sylvania provided similar energy efficient illumination of this Memorial. Osram-Sylvania has recently been testing new lamps and filters as further enhancements. The NPS will review the results later this month.

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BINGAMAN

Question 1a. I would like to ask several questions concerning the 2003 amendments to the Commemorative Works Act. In addition to establishing the Reserve, section 206 of that Act directed the National Park Service, in consultation with NCPC and the Commission of Fine Arts, to report to Congress within six months with plans to limit the sale or distribution of merchandise to less intrusive areas, instead of allowing merchandise kiosks near the Lincoln and Vietnam Memorials. The amendment also directed the Park Service to report on plans to relocate or re-design concession facilities within the Reserve to make them compatible with the

Reserve's character, as well as plans for the horse stables. I have reviewed the March 14, 2005 letter that the National Park Service sent to the Committee's Republican staff regarding these issues.

When will the Department transmit a report to the Committee as required by law?

Answer. We anticipate transmitting a report to the Committee by July 2005.

Question 1b. Section 206 required the report to be completed within 6 months after the date of enactment, or May 2004. Why has it taken so long for the report to be completed?

Answer. The NPS apologizes for the delay in completing the report. We believed it was important to resolve compliance and design approval issues regarding security improvements and visitor service facilities on the western end of the National Mall prior to engaging the public and reviewing commissions on additional issues.

Question 1c. The section directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare the report in consultation with the National Capitol Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts. Have both commissions been consulted on either the interim report or final report?

Answer. Consultation with the NCPC and the Commission of Fine Arts is in progress.

Question 2a. As I understand the Department of the Interior's position based on the interim report letter, the Department does not intend to relocate the existing sites where merchandise is sold under a First Amendment permit, except during a temporary construction project.

Your letter states that the outcome of previous litigation limits sale items and dimensions of sale sites. As I understand the case history on this issue, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld National Park Service regulations which banned the sale of T-shirts on the Mall and other National Park Service administered sites in and around Washington. Has the issue of the specific merchandise sales at issue in the section 206 report been litigated and is the National Park Service under any court order to allow the sale of these items at their current location?

Answer. The Court of Appeals did uphold the constitutionality of the NPS sales regulation, which limited what may be sold, limited the dimensions of a sales site, and provided that sales may occur as part of a demonstration or special event except for certain restricted areas. The issue of limiting merchandise sales and relocating sale structures at issue in the section 206 report were never part of the NPS sales regulation and thus has not been litigated. The NPS demonstration and sales regulations, however, currently allow such sales and sale structures, and these regulations have been upheld with the specific admonition that they are to be "enforced uniformly and without discrimination."

Question 2b. How do you distinguish the sale of merchandise from the vigil sites, as your letter refers to them, and the T-shirt vendors, which also claimed a First Amendment connection?

Answer. The majority of the demonstrators at the vigil sites were plaintiffs in their unsuccessful lawsuits that challenged the NPS sales regulation, at which time the court declared that the demonstrators' purpose was to "educate the general public about their respective beliefs and activities." While it is clear during the litigation that opportunistic T-shirt vendors asserted a First Amendment connection to sell on parkland, once the NPS sales regulation was upheld and enforcement began, these T-shirt vendors left, while the vigil site demonstrators continued their expressive and sales activities under permit.

Question 2c. At what point, if any, does the sale of merchandise under a First Amendment permit become the predominant use instead of the underlying claimed use?

Answer. Under NPS regulations, the sales must be part of a permitted demonstration or special event. There is no gradation point whether the sale is the predominant rather than the underlying claimed use, and the courts have held that sales themselves may constitute constitutionally protected expressive conduct.

Question 3a. The interim report letter states that other uses of the affected area, such as high school band concerts, could be prohibited from using the site if the existing uses are banned.

Does the National Park Service authorize band concerts under First Amendment permits?

Answer. The NPS authorizes band concerts under a special event permit, while religious services and demonstration occur under a demonstration permit. NPS regulations generally define special events as sporting events, pageants, celebrations, historical reenactments, regattas, exhibitions, fairs, festivals and similar events. Demonstrations are defined as picketing, speechmaking, marching, vigils and reli-

gious services and like forms of conduct which involve the communication or expression of views or grievances which has the intent or effect of drawing a crowd of on-lookers.

If regulations were modified or issued to expand the current restricted area at the Lincoln Memorial or the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the changes would preclude not only any vigil site activities but would also preclude hundreds of other traditional events and demonstrations that regularly occur there such as fairs, festivals, high school band concerts, religious services, and other demonstrations. Indeed, an extended restricted zone would have precluded the 1963 March on Washington, the 2000 Millennium Celebration, or the long-standing Easter Sunrise services. In weighing the creation of any restricted area, the NPS must carefully consider the need to preserve “an atmosphere of calm, tranquility, and reverence” within the memorials but also whether it is “an unreasonable limitation on First Amendment activity.” The NPS’s balancing effort was unsuccessful, however, when the Vietnam Veterans Memorial restricted zone was struck down as unconstitutional as applied to literature distribution on the sidewalks at Henry Bacon Drive and Constitution Avenue because it “burden[ed] substantially more speech than is necessary to further the government’s legislative interests.”

Question 3b. Does any other permitted event result in what is essentially a permanent, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week presence on the exact same location on the Mall?

Answer. There have been other permitted events that occur at one location 24 hours a day and 7 days a week within the Reserve. For example, in Lafayette Park there have been long-term demonstration vigils such as during Operation Desert Storm, as well as one 24/7 demonstration vigil that has been continuous for the past twenty years. On the National Mall during the summer months, the International Society For Krishna Consciousness regularly obtains permits for 24/7 activities at one location, although they generally operate during daylight hours. The NPS’s past regulatory attempt to limit the duration of demonstrations was struck down as unconstitutional, but our regulations detailing when a permit is required, how an application is processed, when an application may be denied or granted, and that structures may be erected for the purpose of symbolizing a message or meeting logistical needs have been upheld as constitutional.

Question 4. The authorization for construction of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center requires that the center be constructed and landscaped “in a manner harmonious with the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, consistent with the special nature and sanctity of the Mall.”

In your opinion, are the current vigil sites harmonious with the nearby memorials and consistent with the special nature and sanctity of the Mall?

Answer. Any governmental regulation of demonstration activity is subject to First Amendment jurisprudence and the NPS regulation of demonstration/sales activities on Federal parkland has been the subject of extensive First Amendment litigation. In that regard, while recognizing the importance of the National Mall and its nearby monuments and memorials, courts have stated that “the Mall is more than home to these enduring symbols of our nationhood” in that “its location in the heart of our nation’s capital makes it a prime location for demonstrations. It is here where Martin Luther King, Jr. delivered his famous ‘I Have a Dream’ speech, where both sides of the abortion debate have staged their passionate demonstrations, and where on any given day one may witness people gathering to voice their public concerns. As we have said before, ‘It is here that the constitutional rights of speech and peaceful assembly find their fullest expression.’ In the context of such longstanding First Amendment jurisprudence, and consistent with NPS regulations and policies that allow demonstration/sales activities under certain conditions, the current vigil sites must be considered to be, at least legally, harmonious with the nearby memorials, and consistent with the special nature and sanctity of the Mall.

Question 5. Public Law 108-126 did not direct the National Park Service to ban these sites, it simply directed the Park Service report on plans “to limit the sale or distribution of permitted merchandise to those areas where such activities are less intrusive on the Reserve” and to relocate any existing structures that would be inconsistent with that plan.

Does the National Park Service maintain that there are no other areas on the National Mall where the sale of permitted merchandise would be less intrusive on the Reserve?

Answer. Insofar as the government is subject to First Amendment jurisprudence identified in our response to Question 4, and under NPS regulations, visual intrusiveness is not a condition considered when processing proposed First Amendment permit applications. However, as we detailed in our response to Question 2, during construction on the Lincoln Memorial Circle Security and Road Rehabilitation

project the vigil sites will be moved to other permit areas; and once construction is completed, if applicants request to use the earlier sites, the NPS under its regulations will determine anew whether such activity is appropriate in the newly constructed and rehabilitated area.

Question 6. Can you please provide the Committee with a schedule of when the current construction projects will be completed for the Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, and Jefferson Memorial, and when will the adjacent grounds be reopened to public access?

Answer. The interim security facility and one walkway were installed to allow the Washington Monument to reopen April 1. The Washington Monument grounds are scheduled to reopen in June. Work to restore the Washington Monument Lodge building interior, for ticket distribution and public restrooms, will begin this summer and is expected to be completed in winter 2005. With regard to the Jefferson Memorial, we hope to have full design approval by winter 2005, with construction starting in Spring 2006. Construction duration is estimated at 12-14 months. Work on approved portions of the project at the Lincoln Memorial began in February 2004. Meetings with the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer to resolve differences concerning the east side security design are continuing. Project completion is now expected in the summer 2006.

Question 7. Your testimony discusses the agreement the Park Service entered into in 2003 with the Trust for the National Mall to assist in fundraising for enhancements to the Mall. How much money has been raised to date by the Trust and what are the priorities for the use of those funds?

Answer. The Trust for the National Mall is currently working on organizational development, and has not yet launched a public fundraising campaign to benefit the National Mall, as our fundraising agreement with them requires approval of a formal fundraising plan, prior to any fundraising activities. The NPS will consult with the various congressional oversight committees on the submitted proposed fundraising plan. Once this process has been completed and the plan is approved by the NPS, the Trust plans to launch public fund raising efforts and thereafter undertake at least two major projects in its first 2-5 years: the restoration of the Reflecting Pool adjacent to the Lincoln Memorial and the renovation of the pool in Constitution Gardens. The Trust is working with the National Park Service to identify other projects through the National Mall Comprehensive Management Plan designed to achieve discernible improvements in the parkland, including work on plantings, grass, trees, irrigation, sanitation, trash collection, recycling, and park furniture. The Trust is also working to develop programs to enhance visitors' experience of the National Mall, in ways that will highlight the history and people that have made the National Mall one of the great urban cultural landscapes in the world.

Question 8. There has been much discussion about using a revitalized South Capitol Street corridor as a site for new commemorative works. Your written testimony states that "while South Capitol Street would provide multiple sites for cultural institutions, museums, and memorials as well as parkland, it is not envisioned that this would be managed by the National Park Service." Who would manage these national memorials, if not the National Park Service?

Answer. South Capitol Street is undergoing a transition that has the promise of transforming it into a major boulevard in Washington, DC. In our judgment, South Capitol Street should not be added to the National Mall, but should be developed to have its own unique identity. It should not be a Federal enclave, but instead, should include a mix of uses, including sites for commemorative works and museums like Pennsylvania Avenue has between the Capitol and the White House. Without managing the streetscape, NPS could manage any future national memorials located on South Capitol Street. If a new commemorative work is located on privately-owned property, NPS management could be accomplished by the United States acquiring the property as parkland to be administered by the NPS, before or after the commemorative work is completed, or, if the new memorial is located on government property, jurisdiction could similarly be transferred to the NPS. Examples of the latter include the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, the Francis Scott Key Memorial, and the African American Civil War Memorial.

Question 9. All of the witnesses talked about the need to do a comprehensive management plan for the Mall. Your testimony stated that the National Park Service has begun a public planning process that would eventually result in a management plan.

How long do you estimate it will take to complete the plan and how much will it cost?

Answer. We estimate that it will take 3 years to complete a Comprehensive Management Plan. NPS currently has \$230,000 programmed for this effort in FY 2005.

The total cost of the plan will be determined during the scoping of the project; however, current estimates range from \$1.2 to \$2 million.

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

EAST COAST GREENWAY ALLIANCE,
STATE COMMITTEE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, April 11, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The purpose of this letter is to provide testimony to the Senate Energy Committee's National Parks Subcommittee on the occasion of your hearing Tuesday, April 12, 2005 regarding the future of the National Mall in Washington, DC. I am providing testimony in my capacity as State Committee Chair for the East Coast Greenway Alliance for the District of Columbia, and member of the national Board of Trustees of the East Coast Greenway Alliance. This is a volunteer position. Following is my testimony, respectfully submitted:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT S. PATTEN, STATE COMMITTEE CHAIR FOR THE EAST COAST GREENWAY ALLIANCE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE EAST COAST GREENWAY ALLIANCE

The East Coast Greenway is a grassroots initiative to develop an off-road bicycle and pedestrian trail from the Canadian border near Calais, Maine to Key West at the tip of the Florida Keys. It is routed to pass through most of the major cities on the Atlantic Seaboard. It is often thought of as the urban counterpart to the Appalachian Trail. The initiative was launched more than ten years ago, and already 21 percent of the route is completed and being used; another 24 percent is in various stages of planning, design or construction, and 21 percent of the balance of the route has been identified. While some of the East Coast Greenway will chart new trail routes through the Atlantic Seaboard states, most of it is simply a matter of knitting together existing and emerging local trails that were/are being created at local initiative to meet local needs.

Here in Washington, DC, the National Mall has already been designated (June 2003) as a component of the East Coast Greenway (ECG). Currently, the ECG route through the District uses portions of the Fort Circle Route (NPS lands) and Metropolitan Branch Trail to reach the Mall, and leaves the District on the Memorial Bridge, using the Mount Vernon Trail to proceed south in Virginia.

The designation of the National Mall to serve as part of the East Coast Greenway, was made by the National Park Service in June 2003, in cooperation with the District Department of Transportation and the East Coast Greenway Alliance. Plans for further recognition and development of this designation include posting the ECG trail blazes along the Mall route, and exploration of the potential to place a Mid-Point Marker somewhere on the Mall that will serve to highlight the route's national prominence. The mid-point of the Appalachian Trail is just northwest of DC near a state park in south central Pennsylvania. It is a custom for through hikers to stop and purchase, then consume, a pint (or half gallon) of ice cream at the park's general store before trekking on. Perhaps a different but similar tradition will emerge among the hikers and bikers stopping in Washington, DC the mid-point of the East Coast Greenway.

Another major opportunity that the National Mall presents for the East Coast Greenway is exposure to the thousands, even millions of visitors that it receives every year, from every State in The Union. A modest information kiosk, with a map of the ECG, information about its route and access points along the Atlantic Seaboard states, and the benefits of greenways and trails to our nation's health and heritage would be an appropriate installation to educate visitors to the Nation's Capital City.

Beyond the ECG's use of the Mall pathways to traverse DC, the Alliance is also committed to a larger vision of what the Mall could both symbolize and actualize regarding human powered transportation and environmental stewardship. The Mall is a perfect location to demonstrate the utility, simplicity and joy of the bicycle. Actions should be taken to make the Mall bicycle and pedestrian friendly:

- Bicycle parking should be upgraded to modern standards and expanded dramatically, providing both secure and covered parking and equipment that is aesthetically pleasing, secure, conveniently located at all Mall destination sites and yet not obtrusive on the landscape.
- Bicycles should be available to rent for tourists in many locations, such as at Union Station, Smithsonian Station, near the Tidal Basin, on Hairs Point, and near the Lincoln and Washington Monuments.
- Designated and improved bicycle routes should be created on existing paths on both the north and south sides of the Mall to provide space for through bicycle traffic, so as to minimize any potential conflicts with the many pedestrians and sightseers enjoying the Mall area.
- Intersections of Mall pathways and busy arterials should receive safety treatments.
- Signs and maps at select locations should provide bicyclists route and other key information—where to get water, food, a flat repaired, a phone or find a restroom.
- Furthermore, these maps should show people how they can use a bicycle to get to new monuments and museums that are located off the Mall, such as in East Potomac Park, along the Anacostia River, or into the neighborhoods of DC, which have their own fascinating histories and cultural attractions.
- Access to the south side of the Memorial Bridge should be made safe for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Crossing the motor vehicle ramps at each end of the bridge is a scary proposition.
- Bicycles should be combined with and accommodated on new water taxi's to provide quick and efficient movement of people between destinations that are too far apart to walk:
 - across the Potomac to connect the Lincoln Memorial to Arlington Cemetery and Roosevelt Island,
 - across the Tidal Basin between the FDR, Jefferson and Washington Monuments, and
 - across the Washington Channel to connect the Southwest Waterfront, Banneker Memorial and Hains Point.
- Pedi-cabs should be provided for those who are too old, young, infirmed or tired to pedal on their own.
- Bicycle tours of the museums, monuments and city neighborhoods should be aggressively marketed. The NPS and private companies are already providing some tours, but more could be done if the Mall's bicycle infrastructure is upgraded and expanded.

In short, the Mall should be crawling with people traveling on bikes, as it sometimes already is, but bicycle access and services should be comprehensive, ordered and state of the art easy to access and understand. In short, the Mall should be a model for the nation, of how to make a city bicycle friendly for both residents and visitors, while reducing car and bus congestion, improving air quality and increasing capacity for visitation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. PATTEN,
Chair.

NATIONAL MALL THIRD CENTURY INITIATIVE,
Washington, DC, April 19, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Re: Oversight Hearing on the National Mall

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: During the past week we have had an opportunity reflect on the recent Mall hearing, review the testimony, and speculate on the most appropriate course of future action. We would like to share these ideas with you as a means of summing up our contribution, and make a few adjustments to our proposals in the light of information gained during the hearing.

As you are aware, the Third Century Initiative stood alone, amongst the four persons testifying, in identifying that the existing Mall management system is broken and needs fixing. This failure encompasses both policy development and long range planning. Our answer to this condition was not to propose a change in the functional responsibilities of the seven stakeholder agencies, but rather to create a means of causing them to coordinate their activities, and think about Mall-wide solutions. Creating a Conservancy (or Board of Regents) seemed to accomplish this end. This was intended to be a light touch, not a major overhaul. However, we were not surprised that all three agencies rejected this suggestion as unnecessary. Effective public participation in shaping policy is not desired by any of them.

While all participants claimed that long range planning was already covered by the NCPC Legacy Plan of 1997, all agreed that a new plan is needed. No one commented on the Third Century Mall proposal, which is a direct derivative from The Legacy Plan, using the same parcels of land which NCPC recommends should be utilized to expand the monumental core. Both NPS and NCPC volunteered that they could undertake to develop a master plan for the past three years—that was news. The idea of a volunteer citizen group having the temerity to propose a visionary plan, particularly before Congress, is an anathema, and of course probably an embarrassment.

Our plan is a vision framework not a concrete proposal. It is dependent on an understanding of the National Mall as an idea about our democracy, not a bounded piece of real estate. The initiative's 18 month long program of public meetings, workshops, and task force research activity, has led us to an understanding that active public use has today become the critical determinate of the role of the National Mall. The Mall has evolved into a people's place, a stage for our democracy. It is now the nation's premier open space for public celebrations, recreation, demonstration and healing.

There is another issue which must be considered. The NCPC/NPS Master Plan for locating memorials, which identifies 100 sites throughout the city where memorials might be placed is certainly a worthwhile real estate selection resource. On many occasions it will no doubt be useful, but it is devoid of cultural content. Sprinkling memorials throughout the city is not a substitute for a plan which expands the Mall in a manner which provides memorial sites with a strong cultural context. We believe that continuity with the existing Mall should be a prime criteria for evaluating expansion schemes. The National Mall should be viewed as a continuous entity.

We believe that this plan should not be undertaken by either NCPC or NPS alone because both of these agencies have continually failed to recognize and appreciate that a profound shift has occurred in the public use of the Mall during the past century. Prior to the hearing we met with Mr. Cogbill and the entire NCPC staff; Mr. Childs, and the full Commission of Fine Arts; Mr. Parsons and his staff assistant. As a result we were very surprised when the topic of the importance of evolving public use was not brought up once during the hearing, except by me. To us, this is a signal that an independent group is needed to undertake the planning.

After reviewing our proposal in the testimony, the initiative believes that it might make more sense to tackle the master plan first, and save the creation of the Conservancy until a plan (to conserve) is in place. Therefore we recommend that Congress create an independent McMillan-like commission now to undertake a long range visionary plan which will include addressing the enhancement of the First and Second Century Malls as well as expanding them by the creation of a Third Century Mall. Naturally, the stakeholders would be involved all the way. As would the public. This plan, like the McMillan plan, can be completed in one year.

By identifying new memorial sites and establishing the Third Century Mall as the proper continuation of expansion which began in 1901, the future evolution of the National Mall would be guided for another century. We support the continuation of the moratorium in the so called "Reserve" area.

With the hope that you and the members of the subcommittee will look favorably on our proposal, we feel responsible to suggest a means of proceeding towards realization. There are three critical tasks:

1. The National Mall must be defined as an entity, encompassing the areas designated as "monumental core" by existing legislation. Despite recent assurances, we believe that a full definition has not been yet settled in the minds of NPS.
2. Direct NPS hold all new projects on the Mall until the master plan is completed—one year (give the designers a static target).
3. Retain a small (3) group of well qualified professionals to advise the Senate staff in selecting a team of independent designers to undertake the planning. We have some suggestions as to several persons who would meet this description;

- Charles Atherton, past executive of the Fine Arts Commission, who served during the post-WWII explosion of construction on the Mall, and who has reviewed the work of most of America's leading designers.
- Dorn McGrath, past Chairman of the Department of Geography at GWU. He also directed the Center for Urban Studies, and is past Chairman of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, and past president of the American Planning Association.
- Lee Hamilton, ex Congressman, now Director of the Woodrow Wilson Institute.

We believe that the selection of the members of a Conservancy, while critical to the ultimate success of the master plan, might begin slowly. The Plan which is produced, if successful, may intrigue many excellent potential members. This would make assembling top talent much easier.

The initiative greatly appreciates your including us in the oversight hearing. We have nine task forces which continue to study and research a variety of topics which are of use in enhancing and expanding the Mall. The first of our projects, the Mall history/map brochure, will start being distributed in the next week or so. We believe that the on-going work of the Third Century Initiative will be useful to the design commissioners, once they are selected. We will be most willing to present them either in writing or in person.

Sincerely,

W. KENT COOPER, FAIA,
Coordinator of Task Forces.

NATIONAL COALITION TO SAVE OUR MALL,
Rockville, MD, April 20, 2005.

Hon. CRAIG THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you for holding the April 12 hearing and inviting the Third Century Initiative of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall to testify. We believe that this was the first crucial step towards developing a Third Century vision for the National Mall.

At the hearing, you asked if Congress needs to establish a new McMillan Commission. Our answer is yes. Despite Congress's best attempts to address problems with the 2003 amendments to the Commemorative Works Act, and the NCPC's Legacy Plan and other planning initiatives, the pressures on the Mall continue. As Senator Akaka noted, piecemeal solutions cannot substitute for long-range plans. Divided management has prevented coordinated planning. Even witnesses who spoke against the Third Century Initiative's ideas agreed to Congressional leadership for future Mall planning.

Your follow-up question about who should be on the Commission is equally important. This is a task that demands a high-level, independent, and visionary group of individuals. We agree with Mr. Childs of the Commission of Fine Arts that the Commission should be composed of the finest architects and artists in the nation. But it also should include planners, historians, educators, and scientists of national stature. As Mr. Cooper of the Third Century Initiative pointed out, the Mall is our meeting place for democracy, not simply a work of architecture and design. A plan for the next 100 years requires imagination, inspiration, and a deep understanding and appreciation of how citizens experience on the Mall the enduring value of our founding ideals.

You recognized that planning and management are two separate issues and asked what a Mall coordinating management group might look like. Mr. Childs raised the Central Park Conservancy model, which, he pointed out, did not usurp jurisdiction from the parks commission. Mr. Cooper stated that all agencies could do their jobs better if there were a conservancy-type organization to help them coordinate planning and management. Senator Salazar expressed his surprise that, given the Mall's symbolism and multiple jurisdictions, a National Mall Conservancy did not already exist. It is an idea, he said, that makes sense. We agree. While the agency representatives were understandably reluctant to accept a new management entity, their suggestion that the National Park Service's Trust for the National Mall could fulfill this conservancy role is mistaken. Giving NPS management authority over the Mall's six or seven separate jurisdictions would not work. We believe that the Third Century Commission would be able to advise Congress about the make-up and function of a Mall Conservancy once their planning is well underway, or completed. They would know best what is needed to ensure coordinated management and implementation of the Third Century vision.

Senator Akaka observed that pressures on the Mall will continue and proposed that the Mall could expand. We agree. Even Mr. Cogbill spoke of intensification and his concern that we don't want to lose the open space and have people tripping over memorials. The way to solve that is to enlarge the Mall. Future generations should see the Mall as a place of possibilities for themselves, open to new memorials, museums, and public activities. History does not stand still, nor should the Mall. The McMillan Commission faced the same problems a century ago. Their grand vision expanded the Mall to create memorial sites and vast new parkland. We can be as visionary today in service to the entire nation.

Mr. Parsons of NPS rejected expanding the Mall and instead spoke of 100 museum and memorial sites off the Mall. But groups don't willingly choose off-Mall sites. Instead, they are forced to select from parcels of real estate that have no meaningful connection to the Mall. Mr. Cogbill spoke of expanding the "Monumental Core" for new memorials and museums. But we have learned from the public that the words "Monumental Core" and "Area 1" are meaningless administrative designations that lack the historical and cultural meaning of the Mall. People want to be "on the Mall" because of its powerful associations and symbolism.

A possibility exists to launch the Mall expansion immediately with a new museum and associated public uses. Site selection for the National Museum of African-American History and Culture is now underway by the Smithsonian. The Banneker Overlook site at the end of L'Enfant Plaza is preferred by many agencies (including NPS and NCPC) and citizens groups as having the greatest potential for creating a prominent and iconic destination point. NCPC identifies it as part of the expanded "monumental core." However, there has been understandable hesitation by others, including the sponsors, because it is "off" the Mall. The Banneker site would enable the museum, instead of being shoehorned into a site on the existing Mall that restricts the potential public use, to exploit the role of the museum and its surrounding space for the expression of democracy. All it would take is for Congress to designate the Banneker site, and a bridge connection to East Potomac Park, as "the Mall" and thus initiate the expansion of the Third Century Mall.

Overall, we were pleased to see that the witnesses representing the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts agreed with you and subcommittee members on the need for a new long-term plan, and that the CFA supported the concept of a Mall Conservancy. The disagreement between the agency representatives and the Third Century Initiative's Mr. Cooper seemed to be regarding who should do the planning and how the Conservancy might function. The agency representatives seemed preoccupied with protecting their turf. It was surprising and disappointing that they never mentioned "the public," let alone the Third Century Initiative's ideas which came out of four public workshops and months of consultation with the agencies' staff and commissioners. Sen. Salazar spoke of his personal feelings for the Mall, and the many meanings it holds for different people. That is exactly what we heard from the people who participated in our forum and workshops, but what we didn't hear from the NCPC, CFA, and NPS. The public gave the Mall powerful meaning in the twentieth century, as the meeting place of democracy, and the public voice needs to be heard in planning and managing its future. The Conservancy would serve that role.

Your question regarding the NPS's plan for removing the concession trailers and stables near the Lincoln Memorial is one in which the Coalition is particularly interested. New construction at the Lincoln Memorial is a problem we have tried to bring to Congress's attention. So we were disappointed to hear that the NPS intends to move forward with construction of two new concession buildings without a plan. The buildings' size, location, and lack of restroom facilities raise serious historic preservation issues as well as questions of public safety. These buildings violate NPS's own 1976 master plan. We wonder how they are consistent with the Congressional moratorium. Mr. Parsons stated that he has submitted an interim plan. However we have not seen it. We implore you to take action on this before it's too late. The NPS should stop any construction activity until it has developed, with the input of the review agencies and the public, the Congressionally mandated concession plan and integrated it into the larger Third Century Mall vision.

You stated, Senator Thomas, that this is an opportunity for all of us working together to plan a vision for the Mall for the 21st century. We agree. The new, independent McMillan Commission would work with Congress, the agencies, and the public in conceiving a grand plan that serves the entire nation. Current plans can provide a framework. NCPC's Legacy Plan and Memorials and Museums Master Plan, as well as the South Capitol Street plan, show where geographically the Mall could expand. A Third Century Commission would show us how that expansion would revitalize the Mall's historic concept and propel us toward a grand future for this premier symbol of American democracy.

The Third Century Initiative has, over the past eighteen months, been gathering information, comments, and ideas from the public, as well as the agencies and Congress, on the future of the National Mall. We are pleased to provide our findings, and the continuing work of our nine task forces, to Congress and to the Third Century Commission to enrich the comprehensive planning effort to come. We welcome the opportunity to work with you in developing ideas that came out of the hearing. Please include this letter in the record of the hearing of April 12, 2005.

Sincerely,

JUDY SCOTT FELDMAN, PH.D.,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD MOE, PRESIDENT,
THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

We appreciate this opportunity to submit remarks on behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation concerning review management and planning issues for the National Mall, including the history of development, security projects and future development plans.

For more than 50 years, the National Trust has been helping to protect the nation's historic resources. As a private nonprofit organization with more than a quarter million members, the National Trust is the leader of a vigorous preservation movement that is saving the best of our past for the future. Washington's National Mall, as planned by Pierre L'Enfant in 1791 and revised and expanded by the McMillan Commission in 1901, resonates with Washington, DC residents and Americans generally as a paradigm of great democratic civic design. The significance of the city's monuments, and public buildings and landscape on the Mall cannot be disputed—We believe that sustaining an open, accessible and beautiful monumental core at the heart of the federal city reflects our democratic principles and should not be compromised.

We are sympathetic to concerns over the current inaccessibility of the Mall and monuments, and we regret the cumulative effect of construction and barriers. The ad hoc Jersey Barrier “systems” greatly detract from the monuments’ aesthetic appearance and the visitor experience. We understand that much of the current situation, in terms of inaccessibility and visual impact due to construction, is temporary. Through consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the National Trust has worked with the National Park Service and others to determine how best to meet security needs and preservation and accessibility goals for the Mall, and we believe that, overall, the process is working effectively. The National Park Service has taken pains to improve its Section 106 procedures for the Mall and demonstrated its commitment to preservation by ensuring that almost all of the alterations are reversible—We commend their efforts.

We take this opportunity today to emphasize our support for maintaining the symbolic and physical accessibility of the National Mall by ensuring that security measures are minimal, low-impact, and reversible. Furthermore, as pressure continues for additional memorials, monuments and visitor facilities to be built, we believe that alternative sites must be located and advocated to preserve the traditional monumental core, including parkland, embodied by the L'Enfant and McMillan plans. We strongly encourage the Subcommittee to support the development of a comprehensive National Park Service master plan that will articulate the historic and future vision for the mall, addressing management, maintenance and changes to the traditional monumental core as well as additional sites for public buildings and open space.

A master plan could build on the work already completed through the National Capital Planning Commission's Legacy Plan, incorporate security changes, address the concerns of the general public, and ensure coordinated management and maintenance of this significant and irreplaceable tableau of American monuments, memorials and open space—Moreover, while we understand the need for heightened security, we believe that visually intrusive barriers, serving no purpose other than security, compromise the spirit of our monuments and memorials to freedom and democracy—As part of the development of a master plan for the Mall, we urge the Subcommittee to recommend comprehensive, preservation-sensitive redesign for areas requiring security changes. In many cases, creative landscaping and features such as walls, benches and planters can meet security needs while providing an attractive, welcoming and historically sensitive setting for visitors to the Mall. We recognize that redesign for select areas may require more funding than is currently allocated to install security measures. As a treasure for present and future Americans,

the National Mall deserves to benefit from the best planning and design techniques available.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, the National Trust strongly supports continued vigilance in ensuring that the National Mall is preserved and maintained for all Americans. Security changes and proposed new construction need not damage the visitor experience, nor compromise the historic and symbolic integrity of the monumental core. We believe that comprehensive planning and management for the Mall as a whole, incorporating well-designed security measures and a vision for sites beyond the traditional core, will help protect this resource for future generations—We thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony and look forward to working on these issues with the National Park Service and others.

STATEMENT OF PAUL STRAUSS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (SHADOW) SENATOR

Chairman Thomas, Senator Akaka, and members of this Sub-Committee, I am Paul Strauss, the elected United States Senator for the District of Columbia. I thank you for the opportunity to address you today regarding the National Mall. Since the National Mall is an important asset to my constituents and to visitors from around the world, I would like to weigh in on one of the important issues this Sub-Committee will address today: the expansion of the National Mall.

With the possible exception of the selected groups clamoring for their particular monument or museum to be built on the National Mall, almost all other organizations agree that the National Mall is already overcrowded. The World War II Memorial and the National Museum of the American Indian were built on some of the last available land on the already-expanded National Mall. While these new additions are certainly valuable, the National Mall itself has a vibrant history—as a national gathering place, as a place to celebrate, a place to petition our government for the redress of grievances, or simply as a place to enjoy the great outdoors.

It would be detrimental to further expand the National Mall with more pavement or to accommodate new buildings. Most importantly, expanding the National Mall to meet the needs of additional monument advocacy organizations will overburden the already challenged security system in place. Additionally, your visiting constituents deserve better infrastructure to facilitate their tourist experience here in their national capital. Monuments and memorials in alternate locations can provide better services, greater food options and more convenient access to parking and public transportation than expanding the crowded National Mall could ever offer.

No one is suggesting that this next century will be without appropriate subjects for national commemoration. As our nation's history endures, the number of great heroes deserving recognition for their bravery and sacrifices will surely continue.

They should be honored, but quite simply there is another better option. Rather than opening land adjacent to the existing National Mall for more monuments and memorials, organizations should be encouraged to locate deserving tributes elsewhere in the District of Columbia.

As special and unique as the Mall is, it is simply not the only appropriate land in the District of Columbia which can be made available to honor those who have contributed to American history and cultural development.

Within these hallowed halls of this very Capitol, an example from our own history provides the guidance which illuminates the path before us now. I refer to the historical tradition of "National Statuary Hall," where monuments to leading citizens of the several states were once placed collectively. When it became clear that this one room could no longer accommodate all the heroes of our growing nation, Congress did the only sensible thing. It began to place additional statues on other areas of the Capitol. In doing so, we did not diminish the honor, but instead preserved the beauty of the Old House Chamber which still holds many of those statutes.

Encouraging visitors to travel beyond the National Mall to see more of this great city is only one of the many benefits of an enlightened monument policy. The African American Civil War Memorial, located along U Street in Northwest Washington, is a shining example. Visitors to this memorial have an opportunity to experience a diverse, eclectic neighborhood with excellent restaurants, shops and entertainment. Similarly, new monuments and museums can be built in Anacostia, in Brookland, in Columbia Heights and in other neighborhoods that are Metro accessible and equally capable of accommodating greater numbers of visitors to the District of Columbia.

On behalf of my constituents, I thank you for the opportunity to submit my testimony on this important issue. I look forward to working with this Sub-Committee in the future on this and other issues germane to the District of Columbia. In clos-

ing, let me thank Ms. Melissa Ballowe, of my staff, for her assistance in preparing this statement.

LEWIS D. JUNIOR,
Chevy Chase, MD, April 17, 2005.

Mr. THOMAS LILLIE,
Professional Staff Member, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Subject: Honor our Mall

DEAR MR. LILLIE: I got your email address, courtesy of Judy Feldman, since I have no fax capability right now but, still, wanted to convey some thoughts for the record regarding further developments concerning our mall in Washington.

I first came to Washington (to school) in 1947. I have lived in or been continually associated with Washington, DC. ever since. Although I currently live a hundred yards into Maryland, I continue to maintain my ties since I have a daughter resident in the District, I own some real estate there and, last, I am a little sentimental about "Our Nation's Capital" and our great mall which in character and setting is one of the world's great spaces.

I won't run on about the never ending, and often well warranted, proposals to memorialize him or her, or this or that, by squeezing something commemorative onto the mall. You surely are even more sensitive to that problem than I could ever be. But I do think that the only way to deal with this ceaseless tide is to extend the mall from its present confines to adjacent and other areas of the city.

Some of the proposals recently put to you seem eminently sensible. The new areas should and would be places of pride and serenity, allowing national memorialization of worthy people and events without robbing our present mall of its open green serenity and spacious dignity. (Another consideration, but also important, is how this program would bring vitality and beauty to areas of Washington already badly in need of help.) To continue wedging new structures into the already diminished spaces of the mall does little to dignify the honoree and does further serious indignity to our national treasure.

LEWIS D. JUNIOR,
FSO, Ret.

STATEMENT OF ELENA STURDZA, ARCHITECT, CABIN JOHN, MD

THE IDEA

Searching for the most appropriate site during the 2000—2001 design process for the World War II Memorial, we came up with the idea of extending the National Mall along its central axis across the Potomac River up the hills in Virginia, creating several memorial sites with breathtaking panoramic views of the Arlington Cemetery, the Potomac, the Mall and the city beyond, and incorporating the river into the National Mall.

A GREATER NATIONAL MALL

Because on the National Mall no new memorials are permitted, we proposed the creation of prime memorial sites by extending the Mall using the McMillan Plan design concept to create a continuous unitary space.

A NATURAL EXTENSION

The Olmsteadian Landscape will cross the Potomac on pedestrian bridges to create terraced reflective pools surrounded by double rows of trees up on the Virginia hills, uniting the Mall with the Arlington National Cemetery, the Iwo Jima Memorial, and the Women in the Military Memorial.

THE RENEWED IDEA

We renew our proposal today with two regrettable modifications:

1. Our proposed site for the WWII Memorial will be available to be used for a future memorial of significant national importance instead of holding the most beautiful WWII Memorial, and

2. The Rainbow Pool site will not be enhanced as we envisioned it and, instead, has lost its magic power of offering views of and at the same time reflecting the trees, the people, the birds, and the Monuments over the ever changing sky.

Please see below our proposal submitted in 2001 to the Task Force on Memorials for inclusion in the Memorial and Museums Master Plan.

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR THE MEMORIALS AND MUSEUMS MASTER PLAN

We respectfully ask the Task Force on Memorials to include in the Master Plan our important findings: several new memorial sites on the central axis of the Mall.

NEW MEMORIAL SITES

In the search for the project site for the World War II Memorial we discovered a new dimension for the National Mall—We created several new sites along the central axis of the Mall in the hilly park next to Arlington Cemetery, between the Iwo Jima Memorial and the Netherlands Carillon (see the two attached drawings).*

LOOKING BACK INTO HISTORY FOR ANSWERS

At the time of the construction of the Lincoln Memorial, one of the boldest of the Senate Park Commission plans was to extend the Mall to the Potomac River. Anchoring these remarkable axes would be the Capitol, the Washington Monument and the new Lincoln Memorial.

The Park Commission envisioned the Mall as a pageant of American history: from the creation of the government (the Capitol) to the nation's first leader (Washington Monument) to the savior of the Union (Lincoln Memorial).

THE PERFECT SITE FOR THE WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

Moving along the same line of thinking, we can continue beyond the Lincoln Memorial, to the event that changed world history and made the U.S. the leader of the free world. In the same way that land was created for the Lincoln Memorial, we can create land for the World War II Memorial by extending the Mall farther into the Potomac River. This is the perfect site for the Memorial: on an island of its own, over the water, at the tip of Roosevelt Island, on the central axis of the Mall.

FOLLOWING THE SPIRIT OF L'ENFANT AND MCMILLAN COMMISSION

By doing that, the Mall continues, as thought by its original designers, to be a pageant of American history. The location of the monuments, in relations to one another, should correspond to their place in history. On the site of the existing National Mall we should locate only memorials to events that shaped the history of this country. Across the river we should locate memorials to events which brought America to the international arena.

It is very suggestive to locate memorials to overseas events across the river. While crossing the river, we can imagine that and we are crossing the oceans to reach the places where the events happened. The World War II took place over the oceans as well as on the home front. The Memorial, surrounded by its reflections, will be visible from far away along the river, and from the whole Mall.

THE MALL EXTENDS ACROSS THE RIVER

We can extend the mall beyond this site, up the hills above the river. We can create several terraced overlooks, which may become future Memorial sites situated on the central Axis of the Mall, along terraced reflective pools and walkways shaded by double rows of trees.

THE BRIDGES BECOME PART OF THE MALL

The Memorial Bridge will become a pedestrian bridge with one lane each way from the Mall to Arlington Cemetery. It will become a promenade, with benches shaded by trees. Symmetrically, a new Roosevelt pedestrian bridge, and tunnel will connect the Mall to Roosevelt Island. The bridge will also be a promenade with benches shaded by trees.

It will be a pleasure to cross the bridges on foot without the cars zipping by, with their noise covering the sound of the birds and the river. It will be a pleasure to

*The drawings have been retained in the committee files.

sit in the shadow, in the cool breeze above the river and admire the sweeping views of the Mall, the river itself, the Arlington Cemetery, and the city beyond.

IMPROVING THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL GROUNDS

All traffic around the Lincoln Memorial will enter underground. Glass pools will cover the main circle and its radial roads to bring light to the street below. Elevators from the Park above can access two levels of underground parking with shops and restaurants around courtyards.

CONTINUOUS SHADED WALKWAYS

The two double rows of trees which border the reflective pool will continue around the Lincoln Memorial, along the two pedestrian promenades on the two bridges, into the park across the river, up the hills, on both sides of the new terraced reflective pools, around the new memorial sites, and finally to the last memorial site, the highest, with the most impressive views. This memorial will mark the new end of the National Mall.

THE POTOMAC RIVER BECOMES PART OF THE MALL

Terraces, parks, glass reflective pools and walkways, will cover all the roads along the river. The river itself will become part of the Mall.

COMPLETING THE HISTORY OF OUR NATION

A Memorial to the Founding Fathers should be built around the Rainbow Pool, next to the Washington Monument. Statues of all the most important Founding Fathers and the names of all the others should be placed around the Rainbow Pool. This is the perfect site for it: on the central axes of the Mall, after Washington, before Lincoln.

NEW LOCATIONS WITH DRAMATIC VIEWS

The Vietnam and the Korean War Memorials should be relocated to the other end of the Memorial Bridge, on the natural slope by the Potomac River. Both events took place overseas and we should locate their Memorials across the river. These new locations would be more dramatic with views along and across the river of the whole National Mall. There would be ample space for visitor centers and parking within the natural slope of the site.

WE SHOULD NOT WAIT UNTIL IT IS TOO LATE

It is very important to designate this land now to the National Mall, before it is taken for some other less important purposes.

A MASTER PLAN FOR THE MALL

We strongly believe that a Master Plan based on our proposal must be immediately produced to secure the continuation of the Mall in the McMillan Plan concept, not in a disorderly way, and to facilitate its implementation. It will provide prime memorial sites along the central axis of the Mall and connect the Mall with many more memorial sites.