

9/6/2005 2:59 PM

**Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission**  
**Meeting — March 9, 2005**  
**(APPROVED JUNE 20, 2005)**  
**Russell Senate Office Building – Room SR-253 Commerce Committee Room –**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**Commissioners in Attendance:**

Rocco C. Siciliano, Chairman  
Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Vice Chairman  
Senator Ted Stevens  
D. David Eisenhower  
Alfred Geduldig  
Susan Banes Harris

**Commissioners Absent:**

Senator Jack Reed  
Senator Pat Roberts  
Representative Leonard Boswell  
Representative Dennis Moore  
Representative Jerry Moran  
Representative William “Mac” Thornberry

**Congressional Staff in Attendance:**

Marie Blanco (for Senator Inouye)  
George Lowe IV (for Senator Stevens)  
Ashleigh de la Torre (for Senator Roberts)  
Claire Steele (for Senator Reed)  
Howard Bauleke (for Representative Moore)  
Bryan Whitworth (for Representative Thornberry)  
Trevor McKeeman (for Representative Moran)

**Others in Attendance:**

Andrew Demetriou, EMC Special Counsel  
Louis Galambos, Chair, Legacy Committee  
Mary Eisenhower (People-to-People)  
Susan Eisenhower (Eisenhower Institute)  
Chris Vick (Eisenhower Institute)  
James McCall (Eisenhower Institute)  
Robyn Kravit (Eisenhower Institute)  
Roemer McPhee (Eisenhower Institute)  
Katherine Haley Will (Gettysburg College)  
Susan English, AIA (Gensler)  
Mary Ann Lasch, FASLA (Gensler)  
Tom Hodnett, Director, Agency Liaison Division, GSA  
Thomas Otto, Asset Manager, Urban Planning, GSA Public Buildings Service

**DDEMC Staff:**

Carl Reddel  
Joyce Jacobson  
J. T. Dykman  
Richard Striner  
Eileen Krichten  
Justin Gilstrap  
Brian Krist

Chairman Siciliano called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m., welcoming Commissioners, staff, and guests.

Chairman Siciliano called for approval of the minutes of the Commission's meeting of March 25, 2004 and the Executive Committee's meeting of July 21, 2004. Upon motion made by Senator Inouye and seconded by Commissioner Harris, the minutes for both meetings were approved unanimously.

Chairman Siciliano announced that two major items of business were on the Commission's agenda, the first pertaining to site selection. The Chairman introduced Susan English and Mary Ann Lasch from Gensler, an architectural firm retained by the Commission to perform site analysis of the three possible sites for the Eisenhower Memorial: the Maryland Avenue site (between Maryland and Independence Avenues and 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets, S.W.), the Freedom Plaza Site (on Pennsylvania Avenue between 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Streets, N.W.), and the Yates Federal Building (Auditors Building) site (at the southwest corner of Independence Avenue and 14<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.). The Chairman asked Gensler to make a short presentation.

Ms. English described the Commission's assignment to Gensler as the task of evaluating the sites in a neutral manner to enable the Commission to compare the opportunities and constraints of each site. Referencing page four of the firm's report to the Commission, she reviewed the framework for evaluation. She stated that the Gensler model for assessing the suitability of each site for construction of a physical memorial was the presence of an outdoor space of one acre or more that could accommodate the creation of a significant structure. She stated that the Gensler paradigm for assessing the suitability of each site for the accommodation of a living memorial was the presence of indoor space whose physical requirements awaited further specification and articulation. She added that the firm understood the desirability of the co-location of the physical and living memorials. She further added that associational themes in each site's locale were considered. She closed by listing the other considerations subjected to analysis: physical construction costs, loss of parking revenue to the District of Columbia, relocation costs, jurisdictional issues, the identification of review agencies, issues of public transportation, parking, and security. Ms. English then turned the presentation over to her colleague, Ms. Lasch.

Ms. Lasch reviewed each of the sites as follows:

**Maryland Avenue.** The largest of the sites, the Maryland Avenue site (4.8 acres), possesses an admirable proximity to the two most visited museums on the National Mall, the National Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian. Jurisdiction includes the Department of Education/GSA, the National Park Service, and the District of Columbia Government. Significant potential exists for office space in nearby federal buildings. An excellent landmark location, the site has the following

constraints or complications: street closings requiring regulatory approvals (Maryland Avenue is a part of the L'Enfant Plan), traffic changes, and the loss of parking revenue to the District of Columbia; the maintenance problems of a pre-existing below-grade parking garage and sunken garden, the subject of an on-going GSA study; and security needs.

**Freedom Plaza.** The second largest of the sites, the Freedom Plaza site (2 acres) occupies an interesting position at the border of the downtown business district and the federal enclave. The National Park Service has jurisdiction, but five approval agencies regulate the site. Recent redevelopment was overseen by the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation. The resulting plaza was designed by architect Robert Venturi and has both critics and defenders. The nearby Department of Commerce building and the Ronald Reagan Center are fully occupied, but commercial leases should be feasible. The site has good visibility. Development should be simple and leasing should be uncomplicated. An existing memorial to General Pulaski would have to be relocated.

**Yates Federal Building.** This building is part of a three-building complex and possesses minimal acreage for an outdoor physical memorial. This acreage consists of open space between the existing buildings, and visibility for an Eisenhower Memorial would be poor. While acknowledging the existence of a dedicated Eisenhower Plaza on the grounds of the adjacent Holocaust Museum, available acreage consists of space currently in use as (1) a federal day-care center, (2) passageway between buildings, and (3) a parking and loading dock. Nearby traffic noise is considerable. The building is fully occupied by the Headquarters, U.S. Forest Service, and the adjacent Holocaust Museum administration building is also fully occupied. The Yates Federal Building was named in honor of the late Representative Sidney Yates in 1999. A designated National Historic Landmark, the building's renovation would have to be carefully reviewed. The building has excellent thematic associations to the nearby World War II Memorial. The costs would include building renovation and relocation of existing tenants. Public transportation is good, but perimeter security issues are complicated.

Chairman Siciliano invited Commissioners to ask questions. Commissioner Geduldig observed that the Commission has never determined that a physical memorial can only be created through the model of an open public plaza. He also asked if the analysis should give equal weight to the intrinsic desirability of a site and to the difficulties of implementation. He asked if it might not be best for the Commission to rank its decision-making tasks as follows: (1) determine which site is the best and most desirable; (2) determine if it would be feasible and worthwhile to pursue the site's development. Ms. Lasch replied that it would be justifiable to proceed in this manner if the Commission wishes. Ms. English added that more definition is needed in specifying the nature of the physical and living memorials.

Chairman Siciliano shared some observations with regard to the three sites. He stated that Freedom Plaza has the benefit of single ownership and is subject to community issues. He observed that while the Maryland Avenue site has multiple owners, it also has some excellent features. He observed that the Yates Federal Building entails pragmatic

difficulties given that the building now serves as the Headquarters of the U.S. Forest Service. Commissioner Geduldig observed that the Commission should be mindful of the fact that this memorial will be permanent, while the difficulties involved in its creation are temporary. He urged the Commission to give top priority to the task of choosing the best site. Chairman Siciliano observed that the Commission has previously voted to designate the Maryland Avenue site as its first choice.

Senator Inouye requested that the issue of site selection be set aside for a moment to discuss funding, because Senator Stevens would be obliged to depart momentarily. Chairman Siciliano confirmed that the Commission will require a continuation of funding of approximately \$5 million. Executive Director Carl Reddel observed that current funding will carry the Commission through fiscal year 2006, whereas it is now unlikely that the Commission will be able to complete its work by that time. The Commission is requesting additional funding in the amount of approximately \$5 million to carry its work through the end of fiscal year 2008, when the actual work of construction and the implementation of the living memorial concept might begin. Senator Inouye asked if the funding request made provision for additional architectural studies, and Executive Director Reddel replied in the affirmative. Senator Inouye asked how much of the additional funding would be earmarked for such architectural studies, and Executive Director Reddel replied that the amount of such earmarked funding was \$250,000 for each of two fiscal years.

Senator Stevens asked if the outline of projected expenses was up to date. Executive Director Reddel replied in the affirmative, but cautioned that such projections involved the complexity of operating on a contract basis rather than through a staff of regular employees. Chairman Siciliano confirmed this observation. Mr. Demetriou observed that the funding request does not encompass any funding for actual construction of a physical memorial, and asked if the costs of a possible architectural competition were included. Executive Director Reddel replied that such costs were anticipated on a speculative or contingent basis, as were possible costs for additional Commission meetings in Kansas, Gettysburg, or elsewhere.

Chairman Siciliano directed the attention of the Commission to the second major item of business on the agenda. He reminded the Commissioners that a year ago the Commission had approved a \$400,000 sub-award to the Eisenhower Institute. This funding was channeled through the Department of Defense, and the performance of the Institute pursuant to the grant would have to meet the tests required in Defense Department procedures. Specifically, the grant was given to produce a report specifying a living memorial proposal. This report would have to contain a series of "deliverables," including the following: a draft Charter for the living memorial, along with a mission statement; a proposal for organizational structure and personnel; guidelines for the participation of other organizations in the living memorial at its founding and afterwards; a statement of the initial programmatic breadth of the living memorial; findings or reports from consultants; an estimated annual operations budget and an estimate of appropriations needs. As late as mid-February, 2005, consultations between the Memorial Commission staff and the Institute staff indicated these deliverables were being

developed. However, the Commission has not received the report containing the deliverables, currently scheduled for delivery by the end of April, 2005.

Chairman Siciliano pointed out that the Commission had just received from the Institute a "concept paper" containing recitals of programmatic goals that might be achieved in a living memorial to Eisenhower. The Chairman observed that the Commission would accept this concept paper, noting that the Vice Chairman had earlier made such a request. The Chairman observed that the report envisioned a process by which the various Eisenhower legacy organizations would be put in an administrative basket, a goal consistent with Susan Eisenhower's original submission to the Committee.

Chairman Siciliano stated he had brought this matter to the attention of the new Chairman of the Eisenhower Institute, Brent Scowcroft, in a meeting several hours earlier. James McCall, Robyn Kravit, and Roemer McPhee of the Eisenhower Institute were at that meeting. Chairman Siciliano concluded by observing that the concept paper could become an integral part of the required report, but that the Institute would need to submit this report in April. He then invited Roemer McPhee, a member of the Eisenhower Institute's Executive Committee, to comment.

Mr. McPhee observed that President Eisenhower founded or lent his support to a great many public service organizations. He stated that the central idea of the Institute's concept paper was to involve these organizations in the living memorial in a manner that their work would be supported by the memorial while simultaneously serving as a major feature of the memorial. He contended that the living memorial would always be a "work in progress," that the living memorial might well take on other challenges, and that the funding of this ever-changing memorial would require annual attention. He then invited James McCall, the Institute's Executive Director, to comment.

Mr. McCall confirmed that a flexible platform for the living memorial was necessary, not only to assist the legacy organizations but also to ensure that the legacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower will be well represented and well understood in the future. He stated that a great deal of work on this project by the Institute's staff had not been included in the concept paper. He assured the Commission that the final report would be an excellent product.

Senator Inouye stated that the Chairman's view of the situation was correct, and that the law of the land must govern the disbursement of federal funds. He observed that the Defense Department Inspector General might review the Institute's performance in regard to this grant. Senator Inouye also observed that when the construction of the physical memorial to Eisenhower is completed, the living memorial might eventually be ended unless provision can be made for a permanent relationship to the Department of the Interior, which will maintain the physical memorial.

Mr. Demetriou observed that, beyond the issue of deliverables, the Institute's proposal must be spelled out on a level of detail that can be adopted by the Commission and given to congressional staffs for legislative drafting.

Mr. McPhee reiterated the observation of Mr. McCall to the effect that much of the necessary material has already been generated.

Commissioner Eisenhower stated that the situation provides an opportunity to elicit ideas from the Eisenhower legacy organizations within the next thirty days. Mr. McCall replied that such ideas have already been elicited. Commissioner Eisenhower responded that such specific ideas should be included in an appendix to the report. Commissioner Harris recommended that legacy organizations' materials should include their mission statements and identify their leadership.

Commissioner Geduldig requested that the Commission return to its discussion of site selection, observing that the subject has been under consideration for a long time. Commissioner Geduldig suggested that the Commission state a preference in regard to possible sites and move forward. Chairman Siciliano replied that the Commission had already stated a preference. Commissioner Geduldig responded by urging the Commission to go even further by narrowing its focus, selecting a particular site by a formal vote, and then moving ahead with the development of that site. In the absence of a quorum, he suggested that a telephone poll of the Commission might be in order. Mr. Demetriou replied that such a move might be premature in light of the fact that the Gensler study had not disqualified any of the top three sites. He suggested that action at a future meeting might be best, perhaps supplemented by written consent of members not present.

Chairman Siciliano asked Gensler representatives if the firm was prepared to move to the next phase of their analysis. Ms. English replied in the affirmative, adding that the firm would appreciate additional Commission guidance in regard to the priority of the programmatic goals and additional specificity regarding the definition of the physical and living memorials. Mr. Reddel observed that the responsibility for the instructions given to the Gensler architects had been his alone. Mr. Geduldig agreed to a resumption of the site selection discussion at a later date, if such discussion would lead to a vote.

Commissioner Eisenhower stated his concern about the inclusion of the Yates Federal Building site and the fact that it would have to be renamed. He asked if the Yates Building could be removed as a site possibility. Chairman Siciliano stated his view that the selection of the Yates Building was politically difficult, due to the fact that Sidney Yates was memorialized so recently. Senator Inouye observed that the Commission was in need of a relevant motion in order to avoid the prolongation of deliberations, which he recalled lasted over thirty years in the case of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial.

Then Commissioner Eisenhower moved that the Commission should limit its consideration of sites to the Maryland Avenue site and the Freedom Plaza site. Commissioner Geduldig seconded the motion. Commissioner Harris asked if action was possible in light of the lack of a quorum. Chairman Siciliano replied that the other members of the Commission would be polled.

Chairman Siciliano observed that his experience chairing the construction committee for the Getty Museum revealed a great deal about the complexity of these projects. He recalled that when architect Richard Meier was selected to design the museum, neither he nor any other member of the committee had any idea of what Meier would propose. Chairman Siciliano also mentioned the creation of the Disney Concert Hall in Los Angeles, designed by architect Frank Gehry.

Chairman Siciliano observed that it was time for the members of the Commission to consider what kind of physical memorial they could live with. Mr. Demetriou observed that the Commission had already adopted criteria for a physical memorial: it should be a permanent edifice, architecturally distinguished, and occupying a highly prominent location. Given that the Commission was narrowing its short list of sites from three to two, it was necessary to know if Gensler could rank the two sites in light of the possibility of an architectural competition of architects of Gehry's stature. Ms. English replied that the firm could produce such a ranking with additional guidance from the Commission.

Executive Director Reddel suggested that the Commission be informed of recent public outreach efforts. The Chairman introduced Prof. Louis Galambos, who discussed the Commission's recent achievement, through the work of J. T. Dykman, and in collaboration with Johns Hopkins University Press, of putting *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower* on the world-wide web in a fully searchable format, a precedent-setting accomplishment.

Returning to the matter of site selection, Mr. Demetriou recommended a resolution of guidance to Gensler in the form of instructions to perform a competitive evaluation of the Maryland Avenue and Freedom Plaza sites. Commissioner Harris made such a motion, with Senator Inouye and Commissioner Geduldig seconding the motion.

Mr. Demetriou asked Gensler to give special consideration to issues affecting the District of Columbia government, such as traffic changes and revenue loss. Susan Eisenhower suggested that the Commission explore whether there were other competing interests in the Maryland Avenue site. Chairman Siciliano agreed and Executive Director Reddel then observed that according to information from the National Park Service, the Commission is further along in its deliberations than other competitive users. Commissioner Eisenhower asked if Gensler should be given a deadline. Chairman Siciliano replied in the affirmative, observing that the first-choice site of the Commission, the Maryland Avenue site, has excellent potential, especially in light of its proximity to the National Museum of the American Indian and the National Air and Space Museum.

Chairman Siciliano asked Senator Inouye to confer with Senator Stevens in regard to the earliest feasible date for the next Commission meeting within the next six to eight weeks. Commissioner Eisenhower asked if the Commission might expect to reach a decision in regard to site selection at the next meeting. Chairman Siciliano replied in the affirmative. The target date for the next Commission meeting was set for mid-June. Commissioner Geduldig asked if the next Gensler report would be circulated to the Commission before

the next meeting, and the Chairman replied in the affirmative. Commissioner Harris asked if funding for the Commission would be acted on by Congress before the next meeting; Chairman Siciliano and Senator Inouye answered in the affirmative.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**APPROVED JUNE 20, 2005**