

Date: October 30, 2024

Project: Construct Integrated Bezos Learning Center

Purpose: Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting #5

Panelists:

Name	Organization
Carly Bond	Smithsonian Institution (SI)
Tina Menendez	Director, Bezos Learning Center
Ralph Johnson	Perkins & Will
Zena Howard	Perkins & Will
Elizabeth Kennedy	Elizabeth Kennedy Landscape Architects
Kim Daileader	EHT Traceries
Mike Henry	SI

Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Stephanie Free	National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)	Chris Wilson	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Matthew Fliss	NCPC	Susan Wertheim	National Gallery of Art
Lee Webb	NCPC	Hillary Lord	National Gallery of Art
Andrew Lewis	DC Historic Preservation Office	Jeff Winstel	WMATA
Thomas Luebke	US Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)	Liz Waytkus	Docomomo
Sarah Batcheler	CFA	Elizabeth Merritt	National Trust for Historic Preservation
Carlton Hart	CFA	Hillery York	National Park Service
Sharon Park	Smithsonian Institution (SI)	John Edwards	Citizen
Jeff Schneider	SI	Jane Passman	SI

Kara Katsarelis	SI	Alex Dencker	SI
Alison Wood	SI	David Rader	Perkins & Will
Bridget Lesniak	Perkins & Will	Renato Tonelli	Perkins & Will

Presentation:

At the fourth Consulting Parties Meeting for the project to Construct an Integrated Bezos Learning Center (BLC) at National Air and Space Museum (NASM) C. Bond from Smithsonian began the meeting with the agenda and where the project is in the NEPA and Section 106 processes. C. Bond then reviewed the criteria of adverse effect, as defined by 36 CFR 800.5(A)(1), she then went through the updated assessment of adverse effects for the undertaking. The presentation then paused for the first round of questions.

First Question Break:

A. *Lewis*: Thanks for going back through the revised determination of effect. I know that this can get into the weeds, but we didn't really answer the questions by changing some of them from No Adverse or Adverse to Potentially Adverse. We are at a point, pretty late in the design review phase, and a Potential Adverse Effect would suggest that we would be considering other refinements that would either avoid or minimize an adverse effect. I think we are not at a point where we are talking about relatively minor tweaks to the design, rather than something that would make or break an adverse effect determination. The one that sticks out is the revised determination for design, form, and lighting, since that is the bulk of the new addition. I'm not sure I understand the rationale for saying it's 'potential'. My recommendation is that, even though there has been a great deal of support for the design, to say that all of the aspects of the design combined certainly do have an adverse effect. It is even more notable now that the previous addition has been removed and the museum now is largely, as it currently stands, the way it looked in '76 when it opened. The original design is much more visible and understandable. Even though the current design has some compatible aspects and is reversible, which is one particular way I think it is avoiding an adverse effect, all of these things together are a very substantial change to the setting of the museum. Carly you went through a number of reasons: no such lighting on the mall, people may consider this is main entrance to the museum ... all of those reasons are the most convincing argument that all of the aspects of the design will have an adverse effect. I'm not sure if others would agree or disagree but happy to discuss. Just saying 'potential' leaves us questioning and I am not sure what else we would do to resolve it.

C. *Bond*: I will ask Kim to chime in, but I think I would offer that it is an adverse effect, the main design and form issue that we started with. I think the evaluation that we are lacking is the real effect of the lighting on Air and Space as well as the National Mall, that is a potential for an intensified adverse effect, is there any minimization to adverse effects from our lighting program? Not likely, but we are lacking that analysis. We are going to talk about materials later in our meeting today, and maybe we should have flip flipped the way we set up our meeting to talk about the Assessment of Effects Report at the end, but we had that review in September where we looked at materials and I think that there is a preference on what is appropriate for the glass types and the metal cladding, but that is still undetermined and has potential to intensify or minimize our adverse effect.

A. *Lewis*: That is helpful, although I will say that when we were on site, we had difficulty telling which sample was which, meaning that they were very similar. I think there was a clear preference. But I think that is what I was getting at, is that this seems like a relatively minor point, clearly it is important, but not enough to

avoid an adverse effect, I don't think. But I think you understood my meaning and I just wanted to add that to the discussion.

C. Bond: Kim, is there anything else you wanted to add to this discussion.

K. Daileader: No, I think you hit the nail right on the head. I think 'potential' here is really coming from us further understanding what the light levels are and the impacts that that will have on the on the main entrance of the building. When a person is experiencing it on the ground within the National Mall, is it going to be distracting or will it be soft enough that it does not further affect Obata's design? So, I think we just need to get that understanding in order to make the final determination on the addition.

M. Henry: I am curious to hear feedback, if the design would no longer consider exterior lighting within the façade. Because it has not been analyzed yet that is why the choice word is 'potential' but if it is not implemented, then it still may minimize the cumulative impacts but to Andrew's point, over all it is still an adverse effect, even though it is being sensitive to the setting, context, and adjacent building's design?

C. Bond: Correct.

A. Lewis: If I may, I want to be clear, I am not talking solely about lighting. I understand now, I think the use of the term 'potential' was hinging on whether the lighting may trigger the adverse effect. I am not advocating for removing the lighting, but I think it does need further analysis, as any lighting program on the Mall would. But I was talking about the design, the form and the materials, as well. I was talking about the addition as a whole. I think that the vast majority of what makes up the addition: the design, the form, the materials, and the lighting, and that all of those together do have an adverse effect. That is the point I was trying to make. I don't think we are going to be refining any of these aspects of the design in any substantial way at this point, but I think we have enough information to argue that the integrity of building is compromised or is diminished by the construction of this addition. That is the most important aspect of the entire analysis. We have talked about other aspects, such as removing materials, that is clearly an adverse effect, that is defined very clearly in the regs. But the first one that you talked about, the design form, materials and lighting ... I see this as clearly an adverse effect and if others disagree, that is the purpose of today's discussion. But I don't think that the lighting analysis itself would ever result in a determination of no adverse effect, even if it were tweaked.

C. Bond: Yes, I agree.

M. Henry: Yes, you confirm my understanding of the point. I appreciate that.

C. Bond: We have a bit of time here, so I just want to note that there have been comments from consulting parties that because of the Zoom Webinar format does not allow you all to know who is in the meeting with you, which is a downside of the platform. There are upsides to using this platform, but we have been posting the meeting minutes on the project webpage and listing all of the attendees. So that is an opportunity for parties to see who has been attending various meetings.

Presentation Continued:

E. Kennedy presented the updated larger landscape design and connection with the larger NASM site and the National Mall. R. Johnson gave an update on the entrance to the Bezos Learning Center and the intended signage.

Second Question Break:

C. Bond: We have something in the chat from the last Q&A period, so we will start with that. The question is from Susan Wertheim, related to the topic of entrance confusion: "I understand this structure is for public emergency exit only, but is the landscape meant to be open during normal hours, so groups can eat lunch there, etc?"

Response: Ralph was just talking about that this is intended to be the entrance to the Bezos Learning Center. We are going to talk next about the south entry which is intended for groups. So, for museum visitors and the public that want to access the dining facility on the first floor must come from the Air and Space Building. It is our intent that the landscape exterior and the Learning Courtyard to be open and available for the public to use at all times. I suppose if there is a particular event occurring in the Learning Courtyard, there might be restricted public access for the extent of that event, which happens across all Smithsonian facilities. But in general, the Astronomy Park and Learning Court access will be 24/7.

Does anyone from Air and Space or the Smithsonian team have anything they want to add to anything I just said?

T. Menendez: No, that was perfect, thank you.

S. Wertheim: I am not sure if this is appropriate for this session, but it looks to me that because of the way that the vertical glass and the horizontal slope of the solid that walls are going to be metal clad, the way that they are resolved right now it feels like the building is tilting over. It could just be the renderings from the person view. Is there any study about how to make that resolution different so that the colliding geometry is more resolved? It seems that the view with the protruding balcony that faces Jefferson and the Mall, what is that inside? A stair or ramp? Something behind that glass that is not parallel to the ground? There are a lot of different planes coming from a lot of different directions and I understand that the idea is movement, spiraling, but it seems off putting. Like you would almost feel that it is falling over. It seems like something that could be studied better, to see which way those lines should really be going so that you connect better with the ground plane. I guess it's purposeful that the glass and walls are all doing something different from each other. My other question is: the view from above is very convincing about the spiral galaxy, so is it the intention that when you are inside the main atrium / block of Air and Space and come to the east end and see the Bezos Learning Center from a high view and you immediately know you can go down there and come in? The design from an aerial view, the whole concept is very clear, but it is hard to catch it from what you perceive on the ground. But maybe that is also not part of this conversation.

C. Bond: These are all good things for this conversation, Susan, so thank you.

T. Menendez: NASM's main entrance on Jefferson will be incredibly pronounced, so we do believe that will be a big draw for folks and they will have wayfinding. But we also will do a study to make sure that wayfinding and the flow of traffic is appropriate. And if we need signage we would obviously entertain that, but because this is sort of a little bit pushed back with the Learning Courtyard in front of it, and a lot of the greenery will help cover that, we do believe that the main museum entrance on Jefferson will be where folks will gravitate to. But, to your point, we will evaluate signage because we do not want the visitors confused. We appreciate that.

C. Bond: Thanks Tina. Perkins and Will team, can you provide a response to Susan's question about the many changes in planes at the northeast corner?

R. Johnson: I think the idea on that is to extend out the initial occupied plane so it does not have a roof above it and you can see the sky, and you can see past to the American Indian Museum and the Capitol as well. That is where that angle came from.

D. Rader: It is still holding back from the McMillan line as well. Below that cantilever is just a reflection of that, which could be confusing to the eye as well. Everything is vertical except for this glass wall on the right-hand side. This is really the only sloped surface in that volume.

C. Bond: Can you talk about your design decisions on this slant or the directionality that this glass is taking?

R. Johnson: I think you have to see it from the other side, the street side. There. I think it is parallel to the wall above; it is in the same plane. We are just trying to reinforce this idea of directionality.

T. Luebke: I have a question about the articulation of the garage entrance and just trying to get that right. There is kind of a funny dynamic, balancing two systems: the ziggurat, rectilinear landscape of the original site and the logic of the swirling, dynamic form, curving. It is not well documented. It is hard to tell exactly what is happening here, I am not really sure what I am seeing. There are these stepped things. There are these white boxes that look like ...
[*C. Bond:* Those are existing guard booths.] Okay. Are they going to stay like that? [*C. Bond:* Yes.] It just looks unresolved, particularly ...

R. Johnson: We are continuing the work on that right now in terms of implications of the surface.

T. Luebke: Yea and if you are doing these steps, it seems like you want them to maybe ...

R. Johnson: We are trying to get rid of as many of the steps as possible.

T. Luebke: It looks a little bit like it has been sliced and I am not sure why. Likewise, there is a funny step-up in the retaining wall on the east there that again, why? What is that for?

R. Johnson: It is a tough problem because the clearance for the trucks to get under.

T. Luebke: That part I understand. The part I don't understand is the...

R. Johnson: No, those kind of details we are working on. Where you see the glass upper rail, we are going to extend that out so it becomes more engaged with the building as you come around.

T. Luebke: There is a logic here that is strong, and I just want to see it carry itself through. My other question, which goes the site, while we are here, let's go back to the entrance on Independence. I raised this before, you will love hearing this again: why, why, why is that line vertical?

D. Rader: That is actually the next section of the presentation.

R. Johnson: We have a whole presentation on this.

T. Luebke: Ok, that's fine. Finally, can you go to the plan? There is something that is really funny about the Observatory, and I cannot put my finger on it. About this wall that wraps, that comes strangely up and it intersects the volume in a very unconvincing way. I keep thinking "which system does it belong to?" I think it was Elizabeth's drawing. I am trying to understand; maybe it doesn't want to exist at all. Can you live without it? Just that one segment doesn't really help anything. It feels long and intersects everything in an unsatisfactory way. It should be swirling. It has this weird tangent; it is uncomfortable. Maybe it would be nicer without it. I do not know what it is doing for you.

D. Rader: Can you go to 39 Carly?

T. Luebke: Do you see what I mean?

R. Johnson: I think it needs more work.

T. Luebke: It either needs to be stronger or weaker.

R. Johnson: We are trying to engage the shape of the Observatory with the walls.

T. Luebke: I think that it might work better if it was just a free-floating, circular object in the green field.

R. Johnson: So, keep the walls separate totally?

T. Luebke: Because you have the one gesture of the big wall that comes in this corner, goes straight, it starts to inflect, and it takes you to an entrance. Think about it. Again, this is the question about these intersecting systems and what belongs to what and which one is more dominant. There is such an interesting interplay between the rectilinear, ziggurat, stepping geometry of the original property and this curving thing, and where they connect is always the tricky point. The systems have to exist somewhat independently, and there are these moments where they feel like they are not yet resolved. So, that's all. I continue to be supportive of the design.

R. Johnson: Yes, we appreciate the comments and we have got some more detailing work that needs to be done.

C. Bond: Ok, we have two more questions. Our next question is from Carlton Hart: "What is the program for the plaza surrounding the Observatory? This seems to be a very large area, but there are no benches or places to sit, so it feels like a vestige and not purposeful. Can you talk about how you want to use it?"

M. Henry: I can answer that initially Carly. What we have planned for the plaza surrounding the Observatory is known as an Astronomy Park. The intent is for it to engage learners in astronomy through self-directed, interactive experiences. There will be some accompanying interpretive graphics that will assist in fostering their critical thinking as they engage with astronomy topics. The Astronomy Park will have interactives that will connect the concepts that are presented inside the museum in a captivating, kinetic learning environment that will encourage experimentation through active play. It is not going to be a playground, but the idea is that there will be elements on this plaza that will connect to themes in the building that the public can engage with. This will hopefully entertain and engage their imaginations and curiosities. The elements are not developed to a point where we can demonstrate them publicly yet. They are still in development and refinement.

C. Bond: We talked about this before, about how this space actually looks a lot larger than it will be. We still don't have dimensions on how close the Observatory is to the Learning Center, so that is something we will have for the next meeting. And seating at least for now, could occur around the site walls.

S. Batcheler: I agree with Susan Wertheim, that especially in the view as you are approaching the building up the ramp, it may be that in an elevation view it all resolves, all the angles resolve, but from the direction that people will actually be approaching that volume, it seems to fall apart. Maybe you can go to that view, coming up the path. Yes, that one. There are angles in plan, angles in section, and I guess angles in elevation essentially. The canopy above the upper terrace seems to be angling up underneath the terrace itself, then you have the wall angling out, the other wall angling in a different direction, and then angle at the slice at the outside. I think it looks kind of jumbled and this is a very important view, obviously. I would recommend further study in this area to make sure that this is what you are going to be seeing. It does look sort of ramshackle. The other thing was, if you take an approach with the site walls around the property, just simplify as much as possible, I think that will help a lot. That is what Tom was talking about, just where you cannot have a step, don't have a step. My final question is about, you mentioned that the site walls along Jefferson Drive, are going to be lower than what they currently are. Can you clarify? I know we had a lot of discussions about the heights of these walls with the revitalization project. Can you clarify what they would have been originally, what they are now, and what you are proposing to do? What is the current height and

what is the comparative height that was changed in the eighties? I mean prior to the changes in the eighties. And what is the existing condition of that wall.

D. Rader: Ok we are going to have to get back to you on that one.

S. Batcheler: Okay. The reason that I am asking is that because this is a Section 106 meeting, are you bringing it closer to the height it was originally because it was changed to be higher in the eighties? Or is the height of the existing walls what they would have been originally?

C. Bond: So, we will pull up some numbers and come back to this in the last Q&A, but on this image on the left, the red is the 1980s heights, that's the existing 1980s. And originally the east terrace here was pretty open and I believe it just sloped down to grade. We talked about that in the last meeting, but we will dig that up and confirm the 1976 condition.

K. Daileader: Carly, if you go to the slide that has the original planting plan, yea there, on Jefferson Drive at the corner, there were three large steps down and then it was a very open sidewalk. There was no wall where there is a wall now.

S. Batcheler: It looks like there was a wall extending from the stairs, at the edge of the planter? Behind, no up from the loading dock. There! Is that a wall or a curb?

K. Daileader: Yes, that was a wall, I believe there is a historic photo.

S. Batcheler: So that is the equivalent wall, it's not quite in the same location, but that's the equivalent wall to the wall that was put in in the eighties, that is being lowered now? So, what was the height of that wall?

C. Bond: Ok we will see if we can figure that out in the next half-hour. If not, we will get back to everyone at the next meeting.

S. Batcheler: Thank you.

Presentation Continued:

J. Johnson presented the updated options and refinements of the façade angle at the south entry.

Third Question Break:

T. Luebke: Thank you so much for doing this study. I find it revealing and it kind of depends on the view. This goes back to what I was saying about the logic of the architecture, and I have to say that there is something ... The straight cut-off is okay, but you get this weird ... is it somehow starting with the big museum, the HOK block; or is it ending?

R. Johnson: Exactly.

T. Luebke: I think it needs to be dynamic. I actually support, Ralph the one that you don't like, Option 2, because it is consistent with the line all the way around the building. Furthermore, I think it looks better from the lower view, at a distance. I want to point out on Option 3, it creates a weird symmetry. The idea of symmetry in this form is so ... it's so much about rotation and off center, spinning. [Option 3] adds this weird kind of stasis to the architecture that I don't think you want. But I appreciate you looking at this; I would even look at maybe the angle, but there has to be, I guess, a logic and you are following an angle that is already in the penalization, so I understand it. But I prefer Option 2, it's strong. So, thank you for looking

R. Johnson: Ok, thanks for the comments. I guess we will continue to keep debating it.

Presentation Continued:

The presentation continued with updates on the spiral concourse optimization and exterior design refinements.

Third Question Break:

C. Bond: Our first comment is from John Edwards: “Option 3 angle clashes with the diagonal of the window opening that one will see essentially right next to it. Option 2 is much more consistent with the rest of the building; it makes the most sense.” And comment from Andrew Lewis: “He agrees with Tom Luebke’s comments about the south entry, that Option 2 angle back seems to work best with the overall composition.” And a comment from National Capital Planning Commission staff that: “Option 2 angle back is the strongest option.”

T. Luebke: It is very interesting to see the inevitable design evolution of these pieces in the courtyard. I think spatially it is better, the way it is canting now, inward. It is very interesting trying to resolve the curves in the flat glass. It makes a lot of sense. I am also in support of the titanium color for the panels and the stone discussion, so that is great. I just want to go back to that little wall by the Observatory. It’s peeling the wrong way. If it were following the logic of the spiral, it would actually be touching on the other side. So, there is that vertical stripe that is the opening in the top of the whole dome; it would be starting on the left side and curving down and then over to the east. There is something that is very, very off about it. When you have the entrance on the other side from Jefferson, you have that wall, it starts orthogonal and then turns in in one big move. Why would you do it one way here and another way there? It’s a big move, it sets up the whole; I would really look at that. You have to find some way to make it look intentional with changes in plane or texture or something. The problem is it doesn’t really want to be there. It’s the view from Jefferson looking up at the building... that’s it! It just seems like there is a simple wall where the ‘Bezos Learning Center’ line is, and then it inflects and becomes the curve. That is your way into the site. Why would you do it differently with that extra curly que? It is hard to tell what is going on because of the scale figure that is in there. I don’t want to harp on something that small any further.

C. Bond: Thanks Tom. Perkins and Will team, is there anything you want to respond to about this comment?

R. Johnson: Good points and we are going to keep looking at it.

S. Batcheler: First of all, I don’t think this wall is necessary at all, whichever way it goes. It also seems to undermine the orbital lines, whatever you are calling them now. It seems to be a remnant of a previous design. It’s been there for a while, and it does not seem necessary. The orbital lines are integrating the geometry of the Observatory itself within the plaza; it is also intersecting that longer wall and unless you need it for grading reasons or something I think it should just be eliminated. Its distracting is what it is. It is not logical, and the curve is odd. That was it.

C. Bond: Ok, thanks Sarah.

R. Johnson: We will definitely look at it; we appreciate it.

S. Wertheim: I have an additional comment on what Tom was saying about the angle and how it meets the big building, Air and Space. I think it would be helpful, in terms of a unifying design concept of treatment to take the layers of the different materials and geometries, but really materials, or blocks or masses, and make them more uniform or unified geometrically. There is this hovering block behind that angled wall, not hovering, but there is a block, yes that. And that looks like it is solid and geometrically related to the Air and Space building. And then you are wrapping it in all these layers of metal and glass. Some are tilting, in terms of being orthogonal to the ground plane. I think it would be helpful to say we have the inner layer of glass, then you have a layer of glass that hits the

ground and comes up behind the metal clad façade, then you have the metal clad façade that is starting to detach? Or trying to look like it is bent? If the next time, or in between, if you could analyze the composition, or maybe you already have, in terms of what those layers are doing from the idea of the spiraling, it would be helpful architecturally to reinforce to have the design a little more unified. I understand that inside block is your starting point, similar to the big Air and Space, and then you have wrapped it in these spiraling forms, but they don't seem tied together from one side to the other. Maybe it would be easier to solve how the layers of the site spiral. I agree, you don't need that extra wall around the observatory because the curved one that curves around the south corner anchors it. I see that you are wrapping the landscape courtyard with a building and then you are also trying to be a pavilion to the big block of the main Air and Space, but I am not understanding how the layers of this design composition are harmonious or unified with each other, geometrically and materially. It might be driven from the inside program, but it is not; it could be simpler. I want to see a diagram that explains.

C. Bond: I follow what you are saying, and it is almost maybe we need something we have done from the spiral concourse for the south side? Where we understand how the metal panels and all the glass and different planes are working together.

S. Wertheim: I feel like you need it on the north side too. First it's tilting forward, now its tilting back. You have such a strong orthogonal set of boxes that you are right next to and then you have this, which you are trying to emphasize this big departure, wouldn't it be ... If the organizing idea is this plane is tilting up and away, this plane of glass, the inner liner that becomes this building, is tilting away from, tilting back, and then x, y, z, and then organize the vertical lines of the mullions and then you get to the end piece. It is a very three-dimensional design; it doesn't really translate into elevation drawings. But it doesn't seem to be hanging together like the other side, the meadow side, I think is tilting in the other direction, isn't it? The metal cladding?

R. Johnson: Its all going from the southwest to the northeast.

S. Wertheim: No, I mean in terms of the vertical plane. Is it tilting ... is the outer wrapper canted?

R. Johnson: No, the structure here is straight.

S. Wertheim: Oh, it is? Ok so that's just an allusion. But the glass plane, the one behind it, the one you said you wanted to make really dark at the bottom, so it disappears ... somehow it reads much better in the night renderings with the lines that are lit up; it a little hard to understand in the daytime [rendering]. Ok this is a good view. See the farthest plane that is wrapping the courtyard that faces north? That is cut at an angle, right?

D. Rader: Yes, that is sloped.

S. Wertheim: When you have your three options you are cutting it at the same angle, a different angle or a third angle, right?

D. Rader: Yes, and the central box I think you were referring to is waiting for an update until we made a decision on the plane, so we couldn't look at that until we knew.

S. Wertheim: I think it is smart to not tilt the plane of the center box because to me ... I know it is minor, and you are not really going to see it, so I would just leave it. But these layers of wrapping and how they all come together, and which geometry is predominant could be a little more unified. It may be that way already, it just doesn't seem to be.

R. Johnson: Yes, we are going to continue to study that. Some is coming from the inside, you are right.

C. *Bond*: Okay, thanks Susan. I think there is an overarching set of comments, there are some complexities here that we need to take a look at or perhaps provide different views of to help parties understand, or to evaluate further how this design is enforcing the spiral concept. We only have a few minutes left, I just want to pass it back to the Smithsonian team, is there any follow up or clarification that Smithsonian wants to provide about the wall heights on Jefferson Drive?

M. *Henry*: I can do that, Carly. A number of years ago we had a Mall-wide perimeter security project. As we developed and implemented those requirements and solutions at each facility, the way it was resolved at Air and Space campus was that the perimeter walls doubly serve as barriers. So, they are reinforced, and their minimum height is 32 inches, that is the internal reinforced elevation, so if there are any cap stones above that, obviously it would be more than 32 inches. So that would answer what we would minimally need to provide around the site and that is what was implemented into the revitalization drawings which the edges of our project area, we are by and large retaining, other than the entrances for the new ramps and etc. As per locations of interim tiers/planter walls, was a significant aspect of Obata's plinth design for the main building. The design team has been working towards simplifying that, as was touched on before. In other words: less steps. We are trying to simplify the number of tiers, where it makes sense. Of course, we need to coordinate and juxtapose it with where they terminate on the main building side, so there is an easier transition between the two. Where we have interim walls for the tiers of planters, it is to achieve some grade issues, as this east end is the most diverse of elevations of; I believe it is 12-foot difference in elevation from the street to the terrace at the northeast corner, whereas it is not as different on Fourth and Independence. So all these internal grade changes as you go around the perimeter, around the eastern site, is where the design team has been implementing proposed solutions with the tiers of planters and implement the expression of the spiral concept of the landscape. I hope that answers some questions. We are not looking to differ from what has been established as a perimeter security requirement, however, we are taking note and have been actively seeking to simplify the complexities of the layers of plantings and tiers within the landscape as well. I hope that addresses the questions that were raised earlier.

CI. *Bond*: Thank you for your time. We are looking forward to meeting with you again on December 12th for the review of the draft Environmental Assessment in support of the NEPA process for this project.