AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL MALL

OVERSIGHT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Friday, June 1, 2012

Serial No. 112-114

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.fdsys.gov
or
Committee address: http://naturalresources.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

74-442 PDF WASHINGTON : 2013

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) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

DOC HASTINGS, WA, *Chairman*
EDWARD J. MARKEY, MA, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
John J. Duncan, Jr., TN
Louie Gohmert, TX
Rob Bishop, UT
Doug Lamborn, CO
Robert J. Wittman, VA
Paul C. Broun, GA
John Fleming, LA
Mike Coffman, CO
Tom McClintock, CA
Glenn Thompson, PA
Jeff Denham, CA
Dan Benishek, MI
David Rivera, FL
Jeff Duncan, SC
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Paul A. Gosar, AZ
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Kristi L. Noem, SD
Steve Southerland II, FL
Bill Flores, TX
Andy Harris, MD
Jeffrey M. Landry, LA
Jon Runyan, NJ
Bill Johnson, OH
Mark Amodei, NV

Dale E. Kildee, MI
Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, AS
Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ
Grace F. Napolitano, CA
Rush D. Holt, NJ
Raúl M. Grijalva, AZ
Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Jim Costa, CA
Dan Boren, OK
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Martin Heinrich, NM
Ben Ray Luján, NM
Betty Sutton, OH
Niki Tsongas, MA
Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
John Garamendi, CA
Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Paul Tonko, NY
Vacancy

Todd Young, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Counsel*
Jeffrey Duncan, *Democratic Staff Director*
David Watkins, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

ROB BISHOP, UT, *Chairman*
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
John J. Duncan, Jr., TN
Doug Lamborn, CO
Paul C. Broun, GA
Mike Coffman, CO
Tom McClintock, CA
David Rivera, FL
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Kristi L. Noem, SD
Mark Amodei, NV
Doc Hastings, WA, *ex officio*

Dale E. Kildee, MI
Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Rush D. Holt, NJ
Martin Heinrich, NM
Betty Sutton, OH
Niki Tsongas, MA
John Garamendi, CA
Vacancy
Edward J. Markey, MA, *ex officio*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on Friday, June 1, 2012	1
Statement of Members:	
Bishop, Hon. Rob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah	1
Prepared statement of	2
Grijalva, Hon. Raúl M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Arizona	3
Prepared statement of	4
Statement of Witnesses:	
Bryant, L. Preston, Jr., Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission	13
Prepared statement of	15
Luebke, Thomas E., Secretary, U.S. Commission of Fine Arts	10
Prepared statement of	12
Shubow, Justin, President and Chairman, National Civic Art Society	16
Prepared statement of	18
View, Dr. Jenice L., Assistant Professor, George Mason University	20
Prepared statement of	22
Whitesell, Stephen E., Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior	5
Prepared statement of	7
Additional materials supplied:	
Farr, Hon. Sam, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, Statement submitted for the record	36

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON "THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL MALL."

Friday, June 1, 2012
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands
Committee on Natural Resources
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:07 a.m. in Room 1334, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Rob Bishop [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Bishop, Tipton, Noem, Grijalva.

Mr. BISHOP. The Committee hearing will come to order. The Chair notes the presence of a quorum plus.

The Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands is meeting today to conduct an oversight hearing on the future of the National Mall.

Under the rules, opening statements are limited to the Chairman and Ranking Member. However, I ask unanimous consent to include any other Members' opening statements in the hearing record if submitted to the Clerk by the close of business today.

Hearing no objection, it will be so ordered.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. ROB BISHOP, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP. The National Mall is America's front yard. Actually, it is the back yard. Our guides have to say we have an East front and a West front, which is a nice way of saying the steps are the East, the left side is the back, which means when the Capitol was built, the East was the front because everyone knew Washington, D.C. would grow to the East, which means this Congress has been wrong from our very inception.

The National Mall is really our back yard but it stretches from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and is the home of the Washington Monument, World War II and Vietnam Memorials, as well as the Smithsonian Museums.

It also includes the area from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial, and millions of Americans will visit these historic sites every year, and it is essential that the beauty and dignity of these grounds be protected and preserved for the future.

Each year Congress has to consider potential changes and additions to the Mall and deliberate on how each proposal would affect this important resource and its finite capacity.

In recent months, we have seen exactly why it is important to advance memorials with caution. The memorial to President Eisenhower has gained significant attention, and in my opinion, the process still has failed to achieve a design with a consensus of support.

That particular situation has worked out. It is my hope that we can learn from the process, what was done well, and what we as a committee of jurisdiction can do to legislate a better process in the future.

This Committee must also consider the pace at which new memorials have proliferated in the past several decades.

We have to evaluate each proposal on its merits, and I believe Congress has done that in the past.

However, taken on their own, there are probably thousands of ideas that make sense. The Vietnam Memorial is very popular and most people find it inspiring. I doubt at the time Congress approved the Vietnam Memorial, they considered the fact that it would lead to a Korean Memorial, subsequently to an enormous World War II Memorial, and now that has been built, people are asking why is there not a national World War I Memorial.

Again, it is not to say that each of these are not meritorious on their own, but the Committee must take a broader view and consider the future generations and their heroes and their historical events that they want to be commemorated, before we ever devour the remaining space in a zealous attempt to immortalize our generation.

Where do we draw the line between elements that are appropriate for the Mall and what has become almost a Gettysburg National Battlefield.

This hearing will provide an opportunity to discuss what we can do better when it comes to the future of our National Mall.

We have invited witnesses who should be able to provide us with a perspective on the care and the planning of this iconic landscape.

I would especially welcome insight and suggestions as to what this Committee and this Congress can do better to preserve the grandeur of our National Mall, and ensure that it continues to be hallow grounds where the greatest heroes of our blessed land are honored.

Every year, we have more and more proposals for additions. We have to figure out the matrix on how we will go forward in that area. For these reasons, I think it is our duty, and I am sure all my colleagues will agree, that we have to preserve a very prominent and fitting site on the Mall for the memorial to Ronald Wilson Reagan.

With that, I conclude my statement. Mr. Grijalva?

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bishop follows:]

Statement of The Honorable Rob Bishop, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands

The National Mall is America's front yard. It stretches from the Capitol building to the Lincoln Memorial and is home to the Washington Monument, the World War II and Vietnam Memorials, and the Smithsonian Museums. We can also include the vast area from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial. Millions of Americans visit these historic sites every year and it is essential that the beauty and dignity of this hallowed ground be protected and preserved as we plan for its future.

Each year Congress must consider potential changes and additions to the Mall and deliberate how each proposal could affect this important resource and its finite capacity. In recent months we have seen exactly why it is important to advance memorials with caution. The memorial to President Eisenhower has gained significant attention and in my opinion, the process has failed to achieve a design with a consensus of support. As that particular situation is worked out, it is my hope that we

can learn from that process, what was done well, and what we, as the committee of jurisdiction, can do to legislate a better process in the future.

This committee must also consider the pace at which new memorials have proliferated in the past several decades. We have to evaluate each proposal on its own merits, and I believe Congress has done that in the past. However, taken on their own, there are probably thousands of ideas that make sense. The Vietnam Memorial is very popular and most people find it very inspiring. I doubt at the time Congress approved the Vietnam Memorial, they considered the fact that it would lead to a Korean War Memorial, and subsequently, that would be used as justification for an enormous World War II Memorial. And now that all those have been built, some have asked, 'why isn't there a World War I Memorial?'

Again, it isn't to say that each of these isn't meritorious on its own, but this committee must take a broader view and consider the future generations, and their heroes, and their historic events, that they may want to commemorate, before we devour the remaining space in a zealous attempt to immortalize our generation. Where do we draw to line between elements appropriate for the Mall and what has become of Gettysburg National Battlefield?

This hearing will provide an opportunity to discuss what we can do better when it comes to the future of our National Mall. We have invited witnesses who should be able to provide us with an inside prospective to the care and planning for this iconic landscape. I would especially welcome insights and suggestions as to what this committee and this Congress can do better to preserve the grandeur of our National Mall and ensure that it continues to be hallowed ground where the greatest heroes of our blessed land our honored.

For all these reasons, it is our special duty, as I'm sure all my colleagues will agree, to preserve a very prominent and fitting site on the Mall for the memorial to President Ronald Wilson Reagan.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. RAÚL GRIJALVA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. Good morning to our guests. I want to thank all the witnesses for taking the time to come and testify before us today.

Today's hearing's title is "The Future of the National Mall." I am glad my colleagues have decided to address this topic. It is always good to revisit our previous successes.

There is a lot to talk about on this topic. I look forward to this morning's conversation.

The National Mall is where we recognize our triumphs and also our failures. It is a place to gather to remember the fallen heroes of our nation, to celebrate culture, to recreate and to learn.

The educational role of the Mall is often forgotten by Congress, and I hope we can discuss that as well today.

Every year thousands of visitors including students from across the country and international tourists travel to Washington, D.C. to learn more about this great nation.

Often the stories and narratives they learn from our memorials and public spaces are not entirely true. Some of our memorials even perpetuate myths.

For example, Lincoln saved the nation. Jefferson created the Declaration of Independence. Roosevelt brought the country out of a great depression.

None of these are lies, only a one dimensional story emerges, a story that idolizes a series of events rather than acknowledges the humanity of the person.

The public space is not only where history is retold, but where history actually happened.

The National Mall is a living, vibrant history book, where tales are told and the power of the place moves us continuously toward

understanding the deeper side of our collective history as a country.

A French-born surveyor designed a public space to signify the Democratic birth of a country. Numerous soldiers camped on the lawn to make a statement to lawmakers about their plight.

First ladies hosted an Easter morning outdoor concert. An African American preacher speaking in front of the Lincoln Memorial ignited a nation.

These stories are among the many that make up the story of our country, where democracy survives and continues to thrive, and our National Mall is a place where we can continue to learn from the past and build for the future.

I look forward to hearing more from our witnesses about their vision for our nation's back yard, and with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Grijalva follows:]

Statement of The Honorable Raúl M. Grijalva, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands

Mr. Chairman, Good Morning to our guests and my fellow committee Members. I want to thank our witnesses for testifying today.

Today's hearing title is the "Future of the National Mall." I am glad that my colleagues have broached this topic.

It is always good to revisit our previous successes. This topic has numerous tentacles for conversation.

The National Mall is where we recognize our triumphs and failures.

It is a place to gather publicly, to remember the fallen heroes of our nation, to celebrate culture, to play kickball, and to learn.

The last aspect of the Mall I highlighted, the educational one, is often forgotten by Congress.

However, thousands of students travel for school field trips every year and many Mall visitors try to learn something.

But, the stories float around that are not entirely true and our memorials sometimes perpetuate myths.

For example; Lincoln saved the nation; Jefferson created the Declaration of Independence; Roosevelt brought the country out of the Great Depression.

While none of these are lies, only a one-dimensional story emerges: A story that idolizes a series of events rather than acknowledges the humanity of the person.

This public space is not only where history is retold, but where history actually happened.

The National Mall is a living, vibrant history book, where tales are told and the power of place moves us continuously towards understanding a deeper side of our collective history.

A French-born surveyor designed a public space to signify the democratic birth of a country.

Numerous soldiers camped on the lawn to make a statement to lawmakers about their plight.

A first lady hosted an Easter morning outdoor concert for an amazing contralto.

A black preacher ignited a nation speaking in front of the Lincoln Memorial.

These stories are among the many that provide the story of our country, where democracy survives and thrives as we move forward.

I look forward to hearing more from our witnesses about their vision for our nation's backyard.

Thank you again for your testimony.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Grijalva.

Our panel of witnesses today include officials from the agencies and commissions who are responsible for overseeing the Mall, along with two distinguished private citizens who will share their expertise with us.

On the panel is Mr. Stephen Whitesell, the Regional Director for the National Capital Region of the National Park Service.

We also have Mr. Tom Luebke, the Secretary of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Preston Bryant, who is the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. Justin Shubow, President and Chairman of the National Civic Art Society, and Dr. Jenice View from Washington, D.C.

I hope I did not butcher those names too badly.

We appreciate you coming here. I think you have all been here and know the drill. The lights in front of you and the timer in front of you tells you how much you have.

We are asking you to confine your oral presentations to five minutes, so the green light means everything is going. When you hit the yellow light, it is like when you are driving and you speed up very quickly so that when you hit the red light, you stop.

With that, Mr. Whitesell, if you would like to start off, we'd appreciate hearing your testimony.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. WHITESELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to appear before you today to discuss the future of the National Mall.

I would like to summarize my statement and submit my full testimony for the record.

The National Mall is a preeminent designed historical landscape, and is home to some of the great symbols of our country.

My summary will focus on the process for locating memorials on the Mall and also on some current projects to improve the Mall.

Proposals for new memorials in the District of Columbia are governed by the Commemorative Works Act. The procedures, as set forth in this law, are built on four basic tenets. One, it delegates decision making of the siting and design of memorials to those agencies already legislatively charged with planning and urban design review authority.

Two, it precludes commemorations prior to 25 years from the date of the death of an individual or the death of the last surviving member of a group, or the occurrence of an event in order to maintain the appropriate historical perspective.

Three, it limits commemoration of military subjects to major conflicts or branches of Service with the intention that most future military memorials would be placed on military lands.

Four, it addresses where memorials can be built.

In 2003, Congress determined that the Mall is a completed work of civic art and established the reserve, an area in which no new memorials would be permitted.

At that time, there were 31 memorials already in place or approved on the Mall. Congress has twice made exceptions to the prohibition of new memorials, museums and visitor centers in the reserve, in 2003, for the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and in 2009, for a plaque honoring Senator Robert Dole at the World War II Memorial.

In addition, the Vietnam Veterans Visitor Center was authorized in the same law which established the reserve.

There are currently 12 bills before Congress to establish eight new commemorative works. The National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission has studied these bills as well over 70 other memorial bills introduced since 1986.

At various times, the Commission has recommended amendments to the bills or locating the memorial on lands not covered by the Commemorative Works Act or commemorating the subject in a manner other than a traditional memorial.

Turning to operational matters, the demands on the National Mall are constant and wide ranging. Each year there are over 3,000 applications for public gathering's, resulting in more than 14,000 event days of use.

The resulting wear and tear damages turf and trees, impacting the appearance of the historic landscape and providing continual maintenance challenges.

The National Park Service is responsible for responding to the ever increasing visitation with a more sustainable, healthier landscape and improved facilities.

Towards this end, the National Park Service developed the National Mall plan which lays out a blueprint to rehabilitate the Mall, accommodate high levels of diverse use, protect the historic symbolic landscape, improve energy efficiency in park operations, and better meet the needs of millions of visitors.

Implementing the plan will require a reinvestment estimated at $600- to $650 million, which we expect to achieve through a combination of donations and public funding.

A major fund raising campaign is being undertaken by the nonprofit partner, the Trust for the National Mall.

Several projects have been funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, including the D.C. War Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial sea wall rehabilitation, and phase one of the Army Corps of Engineers' Potomac Park levy project.

Other projects include phase one of the Mall turf reconstruction project and a Constitution Avenue reconstruction project, from 15th to 23rd Street.

The turf projects include drainage systems, water collection systems, irrigation and replacing the turf with high tech sod and compaction resistant soil with granite curbs.

Projects that are currently in the design stage include additional phases of the Mall turf reconstruction project, the Mall walkway study, the earthquake repairs to the Washington Monument, the World War II Memorial slurry wall rehabilitation to address leaks and prevent damages to the Memorial, and the Washington Monument screening facility, and Thomas Jefferson Memorial perimeter security study.

Most recently, the Trust sponsored a National Mall design competition for three sites in the National Mall plan, the Sylvan Theater, Constitution Gardens, and Union Square.

The NPS and Architect of the Capitol will use the ideas generated in the competition to develop specific plans to redevelop the sites.

The National Park Service has recently taken steps to improve transportation for visitors, contracting with various tour operators to provide services in and around Arlington National Cemetery and the Mall.

In addition, the National Park Service is working with Capital Bikeshare in the District of Columbia to increase access to rental bicycles around the National Mall.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Whitesell follows:]

Statement of Stephen E. Whitesell, Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is my pleasure to appear before you today to discuss the future of the National Mall.

The National Mall is a preeminent designed historic landscape that extends from the grounds of the United States Capitol west to the Potomac River, and from the Jefferson Memorial north to Constitution Avenue. It is home to some of the greatest symbols of our country: the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the World War II Memorial.

Authorizing a Memorial under the Commemorative Works Act

The Congress provided specific requirements for establishing memorials on federal lands in the District of Columbia administered by the National Park Service (NPS) and the General Services Administration (GSA) through the Commemorative Works Act (CWA), which was initially passed in 1986, and subsequently amended, most recently in 2003. Typically, a group seeking to commemorate an individual, group, or event, works with a member of Congress to pass legislation that authorizes the memorial and designates a memorial sponsor, which would be responsible for planning, fundraising, design, and construction of the memorial. The CWA grants 7 years for the memorial sponsor to gain all necessary approvals, raise full funding including an amount for future catastrophic maintenance, and obtain a construction permit from the NPS. This authority may be extended for three years by the NPS if all design approvals have been granted and 75% of the necessary funding has been raised, or by Congress enacting a law extending the authority for a period set in that law.

Since the advent of the CWA, over 100 bills have been introduced for memorials and 27 of those have been enacted. Of the 27 memorials, 17 have been completed, 5 are currently in progress, and 5 were not established before their authorization lapsed.

The CWA has proven to be an effective means of evaluating memorial proposals and directing the development of those memorials that are authorized. The procedures and guidelines set forth in the CWA are built on four basic tenets:

- The CWA delegated decision-making of the siting and design of memorials to those agencies already legislatively charged with planning and urban design review authority—the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) or the GSA Administrator (Administrator), the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), and the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA). The CWA also established the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC), which includes representatives of the NPS, the CFA, the NCPC, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, GSA, the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC), the Architect of the Capitol (AOC), and the Department of Defense (DOD). The NCMAC comments to the authorizing committees of Congress regarding proposed memorials and legislation pertaining to memorials, such as bills to extend a memorial's authorization, and reviews site and design proposals for authorized memorials.
- To maintain the appropriate perspective on the historic importance of the subject of a memorial, the CWA precludes commemorations prior to 25 years from the date of the death of an individual, or the death of the last surviving member of a group, or the occurrence of an historic event.
- The CWA outlines the eligible subject areas for these memorials to be sited on the lands covered by the CWA and limits commemoration of military subjects to major conflicts or branches of service with the intention that most fu-

ture military memorials would be placed on military lands. When reviewing proposals for military memorials, the NCMAC advises sponsors of the option to locate the memorial on lands under the jurisdiction of the DOD. As a result, such memorials as the National Memorial to Military Working Dogs and the Memorial to Military Spouses have been directed to military properties.

- The CWA addresses where memorials can be built. Although it is called the Commemorative Works Act, Congress provided that its purposes included the protection of the historic L'Enfant and McMillan plans, ensuring continued public use and enjoyment of open space and preserving, protecting and maintaining this limited open space. In 2003, Congress determined that the Mall is a "completed work of civic art" and established an area known as "the Reserve," in which no new memorials would be placed in addition to those already authorized for this location. The Reserve is the core of the great cross-axis of the National Mall.

Siting Memorials in the Reserve, Area I and Area II

Legislation to authorize a memorial grants authority to a named sponsor to seek sites within Area II, which is the area of Washington, DC and its Environs (which includes part of Virginia), outside of Area I and the Reserve. The memorial sponsor may submit a request to the Secretary or the Administrator, as appropriate, to be authorized to consider sites in Area I. Area I, as defined by the CWA, is primarily the portion of the District of Columbia in the immediate vicinity of the National Mall. Its boundaries extend from the grounds of the United States Capitol west across the Potomac River into Virginia and from the Jefferson Memorial north to Lafayette Park. It is an area of deep symbolic significance to the nation. The NCMAC will convene to evaluate the request in a public forum. After discussion and testimony from the public, memorial sponsors, professional witnesses and subject matter experts, if the NCMAC concludes that the subject is of "preeminent and lasting historical significance to the history of the United States," the NCMAC will recommend that the Secretary seek legislation from Congress to allow the memorial to be located within Area I. If the Secretary concurs, the Secretary will notify Congress of this recommendation for Area I placement.

If Congress acts on that request within 150 days and grants that legislative authority, a site can be designated in either Area I or Area II, following the CWA site approval process. Since 1986, of the 27 existing or planned memorials that have been authorized, only 7 have been granted Area I placement.

When Congress established "the Reserve" in 2003, there were 31 memorials already in place or approved for siting on the Mall, including the two memorials not yet built: the World War II Memorial and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. Congress exercised its legislative prerogative to make exceptions to the prohibition on new memorials, museums, or visitor centers in the Reserve for them, as well as in 2003 for the National Museum of African American History and Culture and in 2009 for a plaque honoring Senator Robert Dole at the World War II Memorial. In the same law that established the Reserve, Congress authorized the placement of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial visitor center in the Reserve.

Locating and Designing Memorials under the Commemorative Works Act

The direction provided by Congress in the CWA has been highly beneficial in guiding decision-making in determining both the location and design of memorials. The process is rigorous and sometimes lengthy, requiring multiple consultations and approvals on the site selection and the design, as well as extensive environmental and historic preservation compliance. It requires the active involvement of multiple agencies and organizations. Under the CWA, design approval begins only after site selection is completed. Construction can only occur after that memorial's sponsor has satisfied the requirements of the CWA, up to and including providing funds for future catastrophic maintenance and obtaining the construction permit issued by the NPS.

When memorial legislation becomes law, the NPS works with the memorial sponsor to investigate sites on lands eligible for placement of new memorials. The NPS is involved because all the memorials that have been established under the CWA to date were to be sited on parkland or on lands that would be transferred to the NPS. The NPS works closely with memorial sponsors to navigate a complicated series of studies, reviews, design challenges, agency approvals, and environmental compliance.

The search for the site starts with consideration of the memorial's subject and whether there are locations relevant to it. Sponsors consult with NPS and review the 2001 *Memorials and Museums Master Plan,* a comprehensive study of potential sites produced by the NCPC, the CFA, the NCMAC and the NPS. Investigation typi-

cally involves the study of those sites with the most potential for that memorial, consultation with other agencies, the start of the environmental compliance process, and consultation with the D.C. State Historic Preservation Office (DCSHPO) and others. The site selection process concludes after NCMAC has been consulted on potential sites and the CFA and the NCPC have approved the preferred site.

In addition to commenting to Congress on proposed memorials and legislation, the NCMAC is a consulting body to the memorial sponsors regarding a memorial's location and design. This consultation takes place in meetings that are open to the public following public notice. Differing from the approval roles the CWA assigns to the Secretary, the CFA and the NCPC, the role of NCMAC is advisory.

The CFA and the NCPC typically undertake the site selection and design review process in parallel. The CFA reviews site selection and design for each memorial and must approve both in order for the NPS to issue a permit for construction. The site selection process can take several reviews before a site is approved, and the CFA may apply design guidelines developed with the NCPC. After a site is approved by the CFA, the NCPC, and the Secretary, the CFA will review the design for approval at two stages—concept and final. The CFA site and design reviews takes place in public meetings.

The NCPC must also approve the memorial site and design. The NCPC may apply joint guidelines developed with CFA or develop independent, mitigation-related guidelines as part of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 process, or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. After approval of the site by CFA, NCPC, and the Secretary, the NCPC will review the design for approval at two stages—preliminary and final. The NCPC requires completion of the NPS's environmental and historic preservation compliance prior to design approvals being granted. The NCPC site and design reviews takes place in public meetings.

The DCSHPO is consulted during both the site selection and design phases to determine whether the establishment of a memorial could have an effect on historic properties and vistas. Should there be potential for an adverse effect, then, pursuant to NHPA Section 106, the NPS notifies the public and consults with interested parties, who may include members of the public. This may result in a Memorandum of Agreement between the NPS, the DCSHPO, the memorial sponsor, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and others, to mitigate adverse effects.

The Effect of the Commemorative Works Act on Future Memorial Proposals

There are 12 bills currently before Congress to establish 8 new commemorative works. The NCMAC studied these bills and over 70 other memorial bills since 1986 and made recommendations to the committees of Congress designated in the CWA. The NCMAC has recommended amendments, and at times that proposed commemorations would be more appropriately located on lands other than those covered by the CWA, or more appropriately commemorated in a manner other than a traditional memorial. The NCMAC also provides a forum in which memorial sponsors and members of Congress can confer with experts from the NPS, CFA, NCPC, AOC, the ABMC, the DOD, the GSA and District of Columbia government. The NCMAC's discussions are informed by members of the public, educational institutions, civic organizations, veterans groups, foreign nations and subject matter experts advocating for or against memorial proposals.

The NPS is honored to play a role in the establishment of commemorative works in our nation's capital and we take very seriously our role and duties in the process. The process for establishing memorials in Washington, as directed by the Congress, has worked very well to ensure that new memorials are thoughtfully considered, appropriately located, and beautifully designed. We expect that all memorials, by virtue of the public process by which they are being established, will have all of these important characteristics and will be a source of pride for our entire nation.

Present and Future Uses of the Mall

The demands on the National Mall are constant and wide-ranging. Each year there are over 3,000 applications for public gatherings, resulting in more than 14,000 event-days of use. The resulting wear and tear damages trees and turf, creating a less-than-desirable appearance of the historic landscape and providing continual maintenance challenges.

It is the NPS's responsibility to manage the National Mall in a way that responds to the ever-increasing visitation with a more sustainable and healthier landscape and improved facilities to accommodate the needs of our visitors. Toward this end, the NPS developed the National Mall Plan (Plan), which was approved by the Secretary on November 9, 2010. The Plan is a blueprint to rehabilitate the National Mall, accommodate high levels of diverse use, protect the historic symbolic land-

scape, improve energy efficiency and park operations, and better meet the needs of millions of visitors.

Implementing the Plan will require a significant reinvestment estimated at $600-$650 million including deferred maintenance. We expect to make this investment through a combination of donated funds, goods, services and public funding. A major fundraising campaign is being undertaken by the nonprofit partner, the Trust for the National Mall (Trust). To date the Trust has raised funds for the new wayfinding system, a mobile phone app, earthquake repairs to the Washington Monument, recycling containers, maintenance equipment, LED lighting, and educational programming.

Several other projects have been or will be completed using American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. These include the DC War Memorial ($4 million), the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool ($40 million), the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Seawall Rehabilitation ($14 million), and Phase I of the Potomac Park Levee, an Army Corps of Engineers flood control project to protect the downtown area of the District of Columbia. Ongoing projects include Phase I of the Mall Turf reconstruction project, establishing drainage systems, water collection cisterns, irrigation, and replacing the turf with high-tech sod and compaction-resistant soils with granite curbs. Phase I is expected to be completed in December 2012 at the cost of $14 million. Additionally, the Constitution Avenue Reconstruction project, from 15th Street to 23rd Streets, NW, is nearing completion at the cost of $10 million. Projects under design include further phases of the Mall Turf reconstruction project, the Mall Walkway Study for the sidewalks along the National Mall, the earthquake repairs to the Washington Monument, the World War II Memorial Slurry Wall Rehabilitation to address leaks and prevent damage to the memorial, the Washington Monument Screening Facility and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Perimeter Security.

Most recently, the Trust sponsored a National Mall Design Competition for three sites out for special treatment in the Plan—the Sylvan Theatre, Constitution Gardens, and Union Square. The NPS will use ideas generated in the competition to create plans to redevelop the Sylvan Theatre and Constitution Gardens, with the Trust initiating a major fundraising campaign chaired by former First Lady Laura Bush, to execute them. The information and ideas for Union Square will be given to the Architect of the Capitol, who now manages the site.

Transportation Issues on the National Mall

The NPS has recently improved the transportation for visitors around the National Mall as it is not possible to provide parking for all its visitors. In February 2012, the NPS contracted with ANC Tours by Martz Gray Line for service in Arlington National Cemetery and for a non-interpretive bus from Union Station to the Cemetery, with stops along the National Mall. On April 5, 2012, the NPS signed a short-term contract with Open Top Sightseeing for interpretive bus tours of National Mall sites and to provide transfer points to its citywide tours. In addition, the NPS is working with Capital Bikeshare and the District of Columbia Department of Transportation to increase access to rental bicycles on or near the National Mall, and 5 stations have recently been added. The NPS is currently revising its regulations for pedicabs to manage this mode of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or the other members of the subcommittee may have.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I noticed on the Constitution project, you have those cameras that catch you when you run a red light. I think you just got a ticket.

Mr. Luebke, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF TOM LUEBKE, SECRETARY, U.S. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. LUEBKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Chairman Bishop and members of the Subcommittee.

My name is Thomas Luebke and I am honored to serve as Secretary to the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission thanks you for the invitation to testify today and appreciates the opportunity to contribute to this discussion on the future of 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 initiated by Senator James McMillan of Michigan at the turn of the 20th Century.

Since then, the Commission of Fine Arts has played an integral role in the creation and development of the National Mall as we know it today.

The Commission is the principal Federal agency for reviewing proposals for public and some private structures in the nation's capital. The Commission provides advice on design and aesthetics to Federal agencies, private individuals and organizations, and the District of Columbia Government.

Comprised of seven Presidentially appointed members who are selected for their expertise in the arts, the Commission has a particular role in guiding the design of national commemorative symbols, including monuments on the National Mall in the nation's capital, oversees military cemeteries, or coins and medals produced by the United States Mint. These need to be worthy representations of our nation and our civic ideals.

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 McMillan plan of 1902.

The Commission has reviewed all design and construction on the Mall since 1910, including playing a key role in the siting and design of the Lincoln Memorial almost 100 years ago.

Most recently, the Commission of Fine Arts has reviewed such plans for additions at or near the National Mall landscape such as the Veterans Memorial Center, the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial, the Disabled American Veterans Memorial, and the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of African American History and Culture.

In addition, the Commission contributes an important voice in improving designs for many operational elements added to National Mall sites. These would include security plans for the Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson Memorials, and Smithsonian Institution Museums, the design of the Potomac Park levy gate structure at 17th Street, N.W., and the current reconstruction of the Reflecting Pool and Mall yard panels.

In its active role in reviewing new projects on the National Mall, the Commission also works closely with many public and private organizations having an interest in the Mall, as well as with the National Park Service.

In addressing the future of this treasured landscape, the Commission has cooperated with its Federal partners to alleviate pressure of additional construction on the Mall.

It collaborated with the National Capital Planning Commission, NCPC, as well as the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission on the memorials and museums' master plan of 2001. Building on that plan is the goal to encourage continued development of museums and commemorative works into other areas of the city.

The Commission of Fine Arts and NCPC together created the monumental core framework plan in 2009, which recommended the extension of the commemorative landscape into key areas of the surrounding city.

The Commission has also been an important consulting agency in the development of the National Park Service's National Mall plan. We are pleased to continue a very cooperative relationship with the Park Service.

Included in the Commission's responsibilities is the approval of sites and designs of memorials under the Commemorative Works Act of 1986.

I am honored to represent the Commission of Fine Arts at the National Capital Memorials Advisory Commission, this ex-officio body, expressly established by Congress under the law, to advise on questions of authorization, location, and design of national memorials.

With this group of professionals who are involved so closely in planning and design of the public realm, Congress has an unique resource in considering and evaluating the often competing interests for accommodating commemoration within the monumental core of the city.

The Commission of Fine Arts, since its creation, is the primary design review agency in the nation's capital, and has been committed to encouraging the highest quality of design for the development of the Mall as the nation's premiere 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.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony and thank you for inviting me to testify. We would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Luebke follows:]

Statement of Thomas E. Luebke, Secretary, U.S. Commission of Fine Arts

Good morning, Chairman Bishop and Members of the Subcommittee. My name is Thomas Luebke and I am honored to serve as Secretary to the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission thanks you for the invitation to testify today and appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the discussion on the future of 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, initiated by Senator James McMillan of Michigan at the turn of the twentieth century. Since then, the Commission of Fine Arts has played an integral role in the creation and development of the National Mall as we know it today. The Commission is the principal federal agency for reviewing proposals for public and some private structures in the Nation's Capital; the Commission provides advice on design and aesthetics to Federal agencies, private individuals and organizations, and the District of Columbia government. Comprised of seven Presidentially appointed members selected for their expertise in the arts, the Commission has a particular role in guiding the design of national commemorative symbols—including monuments on the National Mall in the Nation's capital, overseas military cemeteries, or coins and medals produced by the United States Mint—as worthy representations of our nation and its civic ideals.

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 McMillan Plan of 1902. The Commission has reviewed all design and construction on the Mall since 1910—including playing a key role in the siting and design of the Lincoln Memorial almost one hundred years ago. Most recently, the Commission of Fine Arts has reviewed plans for such additions at or near the National Mall landscape as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Center, the Martin Luther King Jr. National Memorial, the Disabled Americans Veterans Memorial, and the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of African American History and Culture. In addition, the Commission has contributed an important voice in improving designs for many operational elements added to National Mall sites: security plans for the Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson Memorials and Smithsonian Institution museums; the design of the Potomac

levee gate structure at 17th Street, N.W.; and the current reconstruction of the Reflecting Pool and Mall lawn panels.

In its active role in reviewing new projects on the National Mall, the Commission of Fine Arts works closely with many public and private organizations having an interest in the Mall, as well as with the National Park Service (NPS). In addressing the future of this treasured landscape, the Commission has cooperated with its Federal partners to alleviate the pressure of additional construction on the Mall; it collaborated with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC) on *the Memorials and Museums Master Plan* of 2001. Building on the plan's goal to encourage the continued development of museums and commemorative works in other areas of the city, the Commission of Fine Arts and NCPC together created the *Monumental Core Framework Plan* in 2009, recommending the extension of the commemorative landscape into key areas of the surrounding city. The Commission has also been a key consulting agency in the development of the NPS' *National Mall Plan,* continuing a cooperative relationship with the NPS.

Included in the Commission's responsibilities is the approval of sites and designs of memorials under the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. I represent the Commission of Fine Arts on the NCMAC, the ex-officio body expressly established by Congress under this law to advise on questions of authorization, location, and design of national memorials. With this group of professionals who are involved so closely in planning and design of the public realm, Congress has a unique resource in considering and evaluating the often-competing interests for accommodating commemoration within the monumental core of the city.

The Commission of Fine Arts, since its creation as the primary design review agency 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 my testimony and thank you for inviting me to testify. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you might have.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bryant?

STATEMENT OF PRESTON BRYANT, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. BRYANT. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee.

My name is Preston Bryant. I am the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission is the Federal Government's central planning agency for the national capital region. We focus on key planning issues that affect Federal lands and buildings.

Our activities include, for example, jointly authoring a comprehensive plan for the national capital with the District of Columbia, reviewing all Federal development projects in the region, and addressing the unique planning issues of the capital city.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak with you about NCPC's role in the national memorial process and our efforts to protect the historic open space and unique urban design qualities that make Washington one of the most admired capital cities in the world.

For each memorial project, NCPC strives to ensure that we implement a process that is responsive and transparent. More broadly our goal is three fold, first, to ensure that Washington's commemorative landscape explores our diverse, rich histories and stories of American history.

Second, to meet the expectations of millions of Americans who visit the nation's capital, and third, as you said, Mr. Chairman, to

plan for the future generations to have excellent locations for their memorial projects.

Under the Commemorative Works Act, NCPC approves the site and design of each new commemorative work that Congress authorizes.

NCPC works with a number of stakeholders, memorial sponsors, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, and depending on the site or location, either the National Park Service or the General Services Administration.

The work of these stakeholders is to ensure the memorials are located and designed in a manner that supports their commemorative purpose and enhances their surroundings.

Because memorials are often integrated within some of Washington's most prominent public settings, the staff works closely with sponsors in either the National Park Service or the GSA to ensure that each new project is designed to the highest standards.

In addition to our projects' specific work, NCPC and its agency partners develop studies. These studies are designed to support the memorial process and plan for the next generation of memorials throughout Washington.

In recent years, one of the central themes of our work has been to protect the National Mall from over building. Over building may diminish the distinctive openness of this symbolic place.

In response to concerns to protect the Mall's unique urban design character and its existing memorial landscape, the National Capital Planning Commission and its agency partners have developed two significant works.

One is the memorials and museums master plan, and second, the monumental core framework plan. Let me say a word about each of these.

The memorials and museums master plan achieved two important goals. First, it identified a reserve area where no new memorials may be built. Congress codified the reserve which includes the cross axis of the Mall in the 2003 Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act.

NCPC strongly supports the reserve policy which maintains the Mall's open spaces and existing memorial landscapes that are admired and enjoyed by Americans today.

The master plan significantly also identifies 100 potential sites for future memorials and museums throughout Washington, D.C. This strategy does a few things. It protects the Mall. It helps sponsor visualized opportunities for projects, and it introduces cultural destinations and neighborhoods in all four quadrants of the city.

The master plan has successfully got six projects to other locations off the Mall, including memorials honoring President Eisenhower, the U.S. Air Force, Czechoslovakian President Thomas Masaryk, the Victims of Communism, the Victims of Manmade Ukrainian Famine, and American Veterans Disabled for Life.

Let me speak to the monumental core framework plan. In 2009, NCPC and CFA published the monumental core framework plan. This plan identifies strategies to extend civic qualities of the National Mall and the vitality of the city into Federally dominated precincts throughout the monumental core.

In doing so, the framework plan identifies several strategies to make potential locations for new cultural destinations located off the Mall more attractive to museum and memorial sponsors.

Examples include precincts south of Independence Avenue, including 10th Street, S.W., and Banneker Overlook.

New cultural projects in these areas can serve as anchors that spark investment, add high quality public spaces and buildings, and provide destinations that introduce visitors to new parts of the city.

NCPC coordinated closely with the National Park Service to ensure that the framework plan's goals and recommendations were consistent with the National Park Service's National Mall plan.

These plans provide the long range vision memorial sponsors need to consider areas beyond the National Mall.

Last, our most recent study called "Washington as Commemoration," provides an opportunity to look closely at trends related to memorial content or location over time.

The NCPC study was conducted in partnership with the National Park Service and includes the development of publicly accessible catalogs of existing memorials on Federal land in Washington, classified by subject matter, theme and location, and you can see this as an interactive online map at NCPC.gov.

The study also includes analysis of how other capital cities in the United States and abroad plan for memorials.

This information will better equip agencies and the public to consider their critical policy and planning decisions associated with memorial development today.

Thank you for inviting me and I am happy to answer questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bryant follows:]

Statement of L. Preston Bryant, Jr., Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission

Good morning, Chairman Bishop and Members of the Subcommittee. My name is Preston Bryant and I am the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). NCPC is the federal government's central planning agency for the National Capital Region, and we focus on key planning issues that affect federal lands and buildings. Our activities include: jointly authoring a Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital with the District of Columbia, reviewing all federal development projects in the region, and addressing the unique planning issues of the capital city.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak with you about NCPC's role in the national memorial process and our efforts to protect the historic open space and unique urban design qualities that make Washington one of the most admired capital cities in the world. For each memorial project, NCPC strives to ensure that we implement a process that is responsive and transparent. More broadly, our goal is three-fold: to ensure that Washington's commemorative landscape explores the diverse, rich stories of American history; to meet the expectations of millions of Americans who visit our nation's capital; and to plan for future generations to have excellent locations for their memorial projects.

Under the Commemorative Works Act (CWA), NCPC approves the site and design for each new commemorative work that Congress authorizes. NCPC works with memorial sponsors; the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC); the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA); and, depending on the site location, either the National Park Service (NPS) or the General Services Administration (GSA), to ensure that memorials are located and designed in a manner that supports their commemorative purpose and enhances their surroundings. Because memorials are often integrated within some of Washington's most prominent public settings, staff works closely with sponsors and either the NPS or the GSA to ensure that each new project is designed to the highest standards.

In addition to our project specific work, NCPC and its agency partners develop studies designed to support the memorial process and plan for the next generation of memorials throughout Washington. In recent years, one of the central themes of our work has been to protect the National Mall from overbuilding, which may diminish the distinctive openness of this symbolic place. In response to concerns to protect the Mall's unique urban design character and its existing memorial landscape, NCPC and its agency partners developed the *Memorials and Museums Master Plan* and the *Monumental Core Framework Plan.*

The *Memorials and Museums Master Plan* achieved two important goals. First, it identified a Reserve area where no new memorials may be built. Congress codified the Reserve, which includes the great cross-axis of the Mall, in the 2003 Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act. NCPC strongly supports the Reserve policy, which maintains the Mall's open spaces and existing memorial landscapes that are admired and enjoyed by Americans today.

The Master Plan also identifies 100 potential sites for future memorials and museums throughout Washington, DC. This strategy protects the Mall, helps sponsors visualize opportunities for their projects, and introduces cultural destinations to neighborhoods in all four quadrants of the city. The Master Plan has successfully guided six projects to superb locations off the Mall, including memorials honoring President Eisenhower, the U.S. Air Force, Czechoslovakian President Thomas Masaryk, the Victims of Communism, the Victims of the Manmade Ukrainian Famine, and American Veterans Disabled for Life.

In 2009, NCPC and CFA published the *Monumental Core Framework Plan.* This plan identifies strategies to extend the civic qualities of the National Mall and the vitality of the city into the federally-dominated precincts throughout the monumental core. In doing so, the Framework Plan identifies several strategies to make potential locations for new cultural destinations located off of the National Mall more attractive to museum and memorial sponsors. Examples include the precinct south of Independence Avenue, including 10th Street, SW and its terminus at Banneker Overlook. New cultural projects in these areas can serve as anchors that spark investment; add high-quality public spaces and buildings; and provide destinations that introduce visitors to new parts of the city. NCPC coordinated closely with the National Park Service (NPS) to ensure that the Framework Plan's goals and recommendations were consistent with the NPS' *National Mall Plan.* These plans provide the long-range vision memorial sponsors need to consider areas beyond the National Mall.

Our most recent study—*Washington as Commemoration*—provides an opportunity to look closely at trends related to memorial content and location over time. This NCPC study was conducted in partnership with NPS and includes the development of a publicly-accessible catalog of existing memorials on federal land in Washington, classified by subject matter, theme, and location. It is available as an interactive, online map at www.ncpc.gov. The study also includes analyses of how other capital cities in the United States and abroad plan for memorials. This information will better equip the agencies and the public to consider the critical policy and planning decisions associated with memorial development today.

Thank you for inviting me to share NCPC's work on commemoration and to brief you on our role in the process. I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Mr. Shubow?

STATEMENT OF JUSTIN SHUBOW, PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CIVIC ART SOCIETY

Mr. SHUBOW. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Grijalva, members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for inviting the National Civic Art Society to speak today.

As an educational non-profit dedicated to the classical and humanistic tradition in public art and architecture, we believe in the importance of preserving and protecting the National Mall and the L'Enfant and McMillan plans that created it as an essential part of our country's heritage.

The Mall and the surrounding monumental core are arguably the greatest work of civic art in the modern era. To highlight this, we recently produced a documentary film on Washington, D.C.'s classical heritage, which is available to watch on our website, Civicart.org.

To envision the future of the Mall, we must understand its past. The Mall as we know it is nearly—just over 100 years old, yet it appears to have been there forever. It is hard to imagine but at the turn of the 20th Century, there was no breathtaking vista from the Capitol to the Potomac, no graceful boulevard lined with noble edifices, but instead, a shabby rambling park anchored on one end by a sooty train station and on the other by a swamp.

This was hardly the vision President George Washington had in mind when he directed Pierre L'Enfant to create a master plan for a new capital worthy of a new nation, a grand scheme of radiating avenues whose geometrical arrangement was symbolically focused on the Capitol, White House, and future Washington Monument.

To this day, these are the landmarks by which we orient ourselves spatially and spiritually. Harmonious, luminous and orderly, the L'Enfant plan and its most important structures were to be classical in design, the physical manifestation of our form of government and political aspirations.

This conscious decision connected the city to the ideals of Republican Rome, Democratic Athens, and the Enlightenment.

As Thomas Jefferson emphasized, the classical tradition is timehonored and timeless. In a letter to L'Enfant, he expressed his personal desire for a capitol designed after "one of the models of antiquity which would have the approbation of thousands of years."

To be clear, our founding architects no more slavishly imitated European architecture any more than the founders imitated other forms of government when they drafted the Constitution. They created an unmistakably American style.

Alas, by 1900, the L'Enfant plan had largely been forgotten. Thankfully, in 1901, Congress created the Senate Park Commission led by Senator James McMillan.

Serving on that Commission were some of the greatest architects and artists of their time, all of whom worked within the classical tradition.

They not only revived the L'Enfant plan, they perfected it. They extended the main axis of the Mall to the Lincoln Memorial site. They also cleared trees and leveled the ground to create one of the greatest manmade vistas and public spaces in the world.

The McMillan plan created a symbol and site of national unity, one that still stands as the physical embodiment of our collective ideals.

Yet, beginning after the First World War, some avant-garde architects abandoned that spirit, beholden to an ideology that rejected the past, they asserted that classical buildings, such as the Capitol, were musky piles that stunk of ideas and ideals whose time had passed.

Indeed, these architectural radicals opposed the designs for the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials.

After World War II, the avant-gardist hegemony was complete. As a result, the Mall came to be vandalized by such buildings as

the Hirshhorn Museum, which looks like an alien spacecraft or a gun turret looming over the public, as well as the brutalist FBI Building which looks like the Ministry of Fear.

Today, we find ourselves in a predicament like that of the McMillan Commission. The classical vision for the city and its monumental core has once again been forgotten, ignored, and violated.

Sadly, the National Park Service and other agencies charged with preserving the Mall have been neglecting their mission.

If any district deserves the stringent protections of a national landmark, it is the Mall as created by the L'Enfant and McMillan plans. Yet, when giving official approval to the design of the Eisenhower Memorial, a post-modern eye sore that clashes with our tradition of Presidential memorials, the Park Service did not even bother to consider the design's cultural and historical impact on the Mall and other protected sites.

The good news is there is a solution. The future is rooted in the past. What we need is a plan for the District of Columbia that carries on the brilliant vision of our founders, a McMillan plan for our time that would preserve and extend the best of our capital city into a third century.

It was none other than President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who made sure that the Jefferson Memorial was built over the objections of out-of-touch elites. He explicitly paralleled the importance of continuity in architecture to that in government, "The principles of harmony and of necessity require that the building of a new structure shall blend with the essential lines of the old. It is this combination of the old and the new that marks orderly, peaceful progress, not only in buildings, but in building government itself."

It is that sort of leadership which is willing to stand up to architects who think they know better than the American people that Washington sorely needs today.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shubow follows:]

Statement of Justin Shubow, President and Chairman, The National Civic Art Society

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Grijalva, members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for inviting the National Civic Art Society to speak today. As an educational nonprofit dedicated to the classical and humanistic tradition in public art and architecture, we believe in the importance of preserving and protecting the National Mall, and the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans that defined it, as an essential part of our country's heritage and future. The Mall and the surrounding Monumental Core are arguably the greatest work of civic art in the modern era. We recently produced a documentary film on Washington, D.C.'s classical heritage, which is available to watch on our website, Civicart.org.

To envision the future of the Mall, we must first understand its past. The Mall, as we know it, is just slightly over 100 years old. Yet it appears to have been there for many centuries. It is hard to imagine, but at the turn of the 20th century there was no breathtaking vista from the Capitol building to the Potomac, no graceful boulevard of trees and paths lined with noble edifices, but instead a shabby rambling park, anchored at one end by a sooty train station and on the other by a malarial swamp. It was abutted by flophouses and squalor.

This was hardly the vision for the city that President George Washington had in mind when he directed Pierre L'Enfant to create a master plan for a new capital worthy of a new republic: a grand scheme of radiating streets and avenues whose geometrical arrangement is hierarchically focused on the Capitol, White House, and future Washington Monument. To this day, these are the landmarks by which we orient ourselves spatially and spiritually. Harmonious, luminous, and orderly, the urbanism of the L'Enfant plan and the architecture of its most important structures

were to be classical in design, reflecting in physical form our political philosophy. This conscious decision connected the city to the ideals of republican Rome and democratic Athens, as well as to the Age of Reason later called the Enlightenment.

The classical tradition, of which Washington, D.C. is part, time-honored and timeless. In a letter to L'Enfant, Thomas Jefferson expressed his personal desire for a capitol designed after "one of the models of antiquity, which have had the approbation of thousands of years." To be clear, the Founding Architects did not slavishly imitate past or then-contemporary European architecture, no more than the Founders slavishly imitated any political structure when they wrote the Constitution. They created an unmistakably American idiom. Who would confuse the White House or Capitol for a building in a foreign country? The Founders consciously connected their modern time with the two millennia-long tradition of classicism. They recognized its dignity, its aspiration to beauty, its harmony with the natural world and human perception, and its capability of expressing hierarchy and meaning to the citizens it serves. They were Founders and Framers not just in government but in architecture. They took the wisdom of the past and adapted and improved on it. Why should we be any different today?

Alas, by 1900 the L'Enfant plan for our national capital was largely forgotten. It had been compromised by commercial pressures and aesthetic confusion. Thankfully, in 1901 Congress created the famous Senate Park Commission led by Senator James McMillan of Michigan. Serving on the McMillan Commission were some of the greatest architects, landscape designers, and sculptors of their time, all of whom worked within the classical tradition as did L'Enfant and his contemporaries before them. Influenced by the City Beautiful movement, they not just revived the L'Enfant Plan, they perfected it. Among their achievements, they extended the main axis of the Mall to the Lincoln Memorial site. They also cleared trees and leveled the ground to create one of the greatest man-made vistas in the world. It is transfixing. Empty space in and of itself is made electric, with the Washington Monument as the lightening rod. There is no official rule that the American people must congregate there for our most historic events and communal gatherings, though they do so nonetheless. They are drawn in by Mall's power, which is welcoming and uplifting, not oppressive. It is a vista of optimism and promise.

The McMillan Plan managed to create a symbol and place of national unity, one that even today stands as the visible manifestation of our collective ideals. The classical L'Enfant and McMillan Plans, together with such masterpieces as the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, are what have endowed us with the eternal capital of an eternal republic.

Yet beginning after the First World War, some avant-garde architects and theorists wished to replace the eternal with the putative spirit of the times. Beholden to an ideology that rejected the past, an ideology that had become fashionable in a crumbling Europe, they asserted that classicism had become passé; it was a deathmask no longer capable of expressing the soul of America. To these individuals, buildings such as the Capitol were musty piles stinking of ideas and ideals whose time had passed. Indeed, these architectural radicals opposed the design for the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials. Frank Lloyd Wright called the Lincoln Memorial the "most asinine miscarriage of building materials that ever happened." The dean of the Harvard School of design proclaimed that the National Gallery of Art was a "pink marble whorehouse." After World War II, the avant-guardist hegemony was complete.

It is due to this total rejection of our national heritage that the Mall came to be vandalized by the Hirshhorn Museum, an alien spacecraft or gun turret looming over the public. This elitist movement gave us the urban-planning disaster of L'Enfant Plaza was constructed, as well as the Brutalist FBI Building, which looks like the Ministry of Fear. Do the citizens of America and government employees who visit and work in these buildings enjoy and take pride in them equaling the National Archives or the Federal Triangle?

Today we find ourselves in a predicament like that of the McMillan Commission: the guiding classical vision for city and its Monumental Core has once again been forgotten, ignored, and violated by accretions of discordant art and architecture.

Sadly, the National Park Service and other agencies charged with preserving the Mall have been neglecting their mission. If any district deserves the stringent protections of a national landmark, it is the Mall as created by the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans. Yet when giving official approval to the design of the Eisenhower Memorial—which is entirely inharmonious with our greatest presidential memorials—the Park Service did not even bother to consider its cultural and historical impact on the Mall and other protected sites in the area. Stylistic harmony, dignity, and perhaps even beauty, are of no concern to them. It is as if the National Park Service

did not care whether an invasive weed was to be planted in a natural park of evergreens.

Not only are the National Park Service and others not preserving what must be preserved, they are acting to preserve what is unworthy of preservation. Although difficult for average man to imagine, in the process of approving the Eisenhower Memorial, the National Park Service, General Services Administration, and others lavished praise on the adjacent Department of Education Building and are now seeking to place it on the National Register of Historic Places. Can one imagine a more sterile, soulless building? It conjures not education but faceless bureaucracy, with all the character and warmth of a computer punch card. Who would miss it if it were demolished? The aesthetic and cultural confusion demonstrated by these sorts of agency decisions is astounding.

The good news is there is a solution; the future is written in the past. What the country needs is a plan for Washington, D.C. that carries on the vision set by our Founders and their architects: a McMillan Plan for our time that would in equal measure preserve and extend the best of our capital city into a third century. Doing so will ensure that the nation's capital remains the physical embodiment of our political identity and our national aspirations.

It was none other the President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who made sure the magnificent Jefferson Memorial was built over the objections of out-of-touch elites. He explicitly paralleled the importance of continuity of tradition in architecture to that in government:

> [T]he principles of harmony and of necessity require that the building of a new structure shall blend with the essential lines of the old. It is this combination of the old and the new that marks orderly peaceful progress, not only in buildings but in building government itself. . ..

It is that sort of leadership, which is willing to stand up to architects who think they know better than the American people, that Washington sorely needs today. We believe your vision can equal that of our Founders, and that this bodes well for the future of our nation's capital.

Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Dr. View?

STATEMENT OF DR. JENICE VIEW, WASHINGTON, D.C., ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Dr. VIEW. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to address the future of the National Mall, a place that is dear to me as a native Washingtonian and in my role as a history educator for practicing classroom teachers.

All of us here believe in the importance of teaching history, and for the sake of today's discussion, let me suggest that good history instruction connects the learner to the story being told and to the significance of continuing to tell the story for many years.

One instructional method builds historical thinking that encourages teachers to share with students their passion for the subject matter through immersion and exploration perspectives taking, and informed debate.

Today's teachers face considerable challenges in helping students engage in historical thinking. Most teachers, including history majors, generally receive poor instruction from their K-12 teachers as well as from their university instructors.

Many teachers feel restricted by standardized tests and in the absence of strong professional development, classroom teachers tend to use methods that are familiar and approved rather than those that are more engaging.

With the Federal funding of the Teaching American History Grants phasing out, there are even fewer opportunities for teachers to deepen their professional practice.

Yet, the creative history teacher can still help students understand and appreciate history.

One way is through field visits to historic sites. The National Mall, with its wealth of memorials, monuments, museums and historic sites is considered the gold standard for history story telling, welcoming over 24 million visitors each year.

It is not enough to drive eighth graders 1,000 miles to stand at the base of a monument and say kids, this is important because it is here.

The thing that makes historic sites and memorials educational is the question why is this still here?

Public memorials and monuments can spark edifying public debate. Memorials might offer the most interesting venues for engaging classroom students in historical thinking through the use of wise interpretation that embraces effective technologies, partnerships, and a posture of humility.

If we truly want to honor the people and events from our history, we must do more than create solitary pieces of stone that largely serve as resting places for migratory birds.

A person or event worthy of representation is also worthy of interpretation that brings the stones alive and places it in a context for understanding by future generations.

The habits of democracy must be engineered into our memorials and monuments using whatever technologies are most effective.

A simple technology involves chalk and paper for rubbing headstones. Another example is teaching with historic places websites, which allows virtual visits to the National Mall before, after or instead of a trip to Washington.

Whatever the technology, it should support the tasks of taking multiple perspectives, asking hard questions, and engaging in meaningful debates.

Effective partnerships between the classroom teacher and the on-site interpreter can be arranged beforehand. However, skilled educational professionals are always ready for a spontaneous moment of insight and know how to support one another with age appropriate extensions for student learning.

The permanence of monuments can create embarrassing errors. One recent and costly example was the poor editing of a quote on the Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial regarding his posture as a drum major for justice.

This kind of error argues the general need for humility in commemorating and interpreting the past.

A recent interview with a Vietnam war veteran focused on the memorial known as "The Wall." Mr. Hatton is certain that without historical context, his eight grandchildren would not have even a fraction of his emotional response if they were to simply visit The Wall.

He would want them to get more than a pamphlet. Instead, he would want them to engage with audio and visual material that offer the context for the war, to talk honestly with a knowledgeable interpreter and so on.

In addition, thinking about The Wall provoked questions for him, such as, is the existence of The Wall a reflection of the social un-

rest at the time? Why was it erected before the World War II Memorial?

These are the kinds of questions that are part of historical thinking and which can be answered through humble interpretation, effective instructional technologies, and partnerships between schools and sites, for the Vietnam veteran, his eight grandchildren, and any visitors 100 years from now seeking to understand the V shaped black granite wall on the National Mall.

All of the stories, the ugly, the beautiful, the bitter and the bold, all of the stories of the United States deserve telling, and the National Mall is one of the most important sites for this sharing.

To be instructive, there must be something to the stories following once upon a time there was a person, place or thing.

I attempt to argue here that a humble interpretation that uses effective technologies and classroom/site partnerships helps to complete the story.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. View follows:]

Statement of Dr. Jenice L. View, Assistant Professor, George Mason University

Thank you for the opportunity to address the future of the National Mall, a place that is near and dear to me as a native Washingtonian and in my role as a history educator for practicing classroom teachers.

I will elaborate on four points in this testimony: the importance of teaching history; the challenges facing contemporary history and social studies classroom teachers; the value of historic sites and memorials; and the urgent need for informed interpretation of historic sites and memorials.

The Importance Of Teaching History

We are all here today because we believe in the importance of teaching history, as a way of reflecting on our collective past, as a way of understanding where we are today and how we got here, and as a springboard for entering our collective future. While few would argue the value of teaching history, there is considerable debate about what it means to teach history well. For the sake of today's discussion, let us posit that good history instruction helps the learner to feel connected to the story being told and to understand the significance of continuing to tell the story many years after the fact.

One method of offering this kind of instruction is by engaging in historical thinking. The current scholarship on historical thinking identifies five core components to evaluating historical meaning, including multiple accounts and perspectives, analysis of primary documents, sourcing, understanding historical context, and establishing claim-evidence connections (Historical Thinking Matters, 2011; Martin, 2011; National Center for History in the Schools, 2011). In addition, critical scholars suggest that it is important for students to understand that history is not set in concrete but rather is an evolving understanding of the past that includes their own histories and that necessarily engages them in the practice of changing the world (Aguilar, 2010; Freire, 1970/2000). What this means for history and social studies teachers is to share with students their passion and knowledge of the subject matter through lengthy immersion and exploration, perspective taking, informed debate, and hard questioning.

Contemporary History and Social Studies Classroom Teachers

Contemporary history and social studies classroom teachers face considerable challenges in providing opportunities for students to engage in any kind of meaningful historical thinking.

Among history teachers in the U.S., few have learned much history content and fewer than half majored or minored in history in college (Ravitch, 2000; Finn, in Ravitch, 2004). U.S. teachers express poor perceptions and behaviors in teaching American history, particularly when it comes to teaching students to read and understand subtext, and to understand cultural assumptions and moral ambiguity (Liu, Warren & Cowart, 2006). A 2000 study by Levstik indicates that teachers and teacher candidates, particularly those who are "white," are often more reluctant to

teach "negative" histories than are their students to learn about the complexities of the past, particularly students of color who identify personally with an unsanitized, multicultural view of history (Epstein, 2009; Levstik, 2000). Teachers expressed a preference for upholding the silences and the politeness of imperfect curricula and non-combative classrooms (Levstik, 2000, p. 297). Teachers belonging to social or racial groups that differ from their students face the challenge of being sufficiently self-reflective about their own positionality to effectively reach/teach students in the teaching of multicultural histories (Gruber, 2006). Yet, Cess-Newsome (2002) and Palardy & Rumberger (2008) are among the researchers that demonstrate that regardless of race or class, a teacher's background impacts instruction. In pre-service, certification, and in-service professional development programs, it is possible for teachers to learn methods of subject matter instruction that augment their own histories and background.

However, most pre-service teachers take history methods courses that either fail to address the instructional purposes of history education (Barton & Levstik, 2004), or fail to merge effectively the history discipline with the teaching methods offered in schools of education (McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen, 2000; Hall & Scott, 2007), or both (Van Sledright, 2011). In addition, pre-service teachers' understanding of history, and their use of the lessons from history, is limited by the range of materials, perspectives, and critical thinking tools at their disposal (Van Sledright, 1995; Edmonds, Hull, Janik & Rylance, 2005; Maestri, 2006). Most college students, including history majors, are exposed to teaching methods that fail to utilize what is known about how best to teach history; generally they have received poor instruction from their K–12 teachers, as well as from their university instructors (Ragland, 2007; Waters, 2005).

For most in-service classroom teachers the goal of promoting historical understanding and thinking historically is severely constrained by professional training, time and insight (Morton, 2000). Once in the classroom, history instruction suffers from poor teacher preparation (Stearns, Seixas & Wineburg, 2000) biased or poorly written textbooks (Ravitch, 2004; Ravitch, 2003; Apple, 2000), and a pedagogy that is driven as much by the demands of principals for an orderly school setting as by the desires of academic historians (Brophy & Van Sledright, 1997). In addition, classroom teachers often feel restricted by standardized tests believing that they are forbidden to teach multiple perspectives or that their students' achievement will suffer from a broader or more complex historical understanding.

The "stories" contained within the teaching and learning of history are often highly contested (for example, Biggers, 2012; Cooper, 2010; FoxNews.com), poorly learned (for example, Gaudelli, 2002), and poorly taught (for example, De La Paz, Malkus, Monte-Sano, & Montanaro, 2011; Van Sledright, 2011; Van Hover, 2008;). In the presence of high-stakes standardized tests for the dominant subjects of language arts and mathematics, and in the absence of strong professional development and community support for the development of historical thinking (Barton, 2008; Levstik & Barton, 2008), P–12 classroom history and social studies teachers—particularly in public schools—typically use materials and methods that are familiar and approved.

Strong professional development would help classroom teachers overcome these challenges. However, finding appropriate professional development experiences is particularly problematic for teachers of history and social studies. From 1986 to 2001, an annual national assessment of student achievement in history consistently revealed that U.S. students lacked the ability to recall basic historical facts or to demonstrate higher order historical thinking. In response, the U.S. Department of Education created the Teaching American History (TAH) program to improve teacher content knowledge of and instructional strategies for U.S. history. A 2005 evaluation of the program revealed that most of the U.S. Department of Education Teaching American History projects were located in school districts serving large numbers of students of color, those with limited English proficiency, and students from low-income families. While many of the participating TAH teachers had post-secondary degrees in history, as opposed to the majority of history teachers who are most in need of professional development, even they demonstrated weak skills in historical analysis and interpretation. (Humphrey, Chang-Ross, Donnelly, Hersh, & Skolnik, 2005). With the recent failure to fund TAH grants in the 2012 federal budget, there will be even fewer opportunities for history and social studies teachers to deepen their practice.

These are the realities under which teachers work. Prescriptive teaching practices are enforced in diverse ways in different localities, but dampen teachers' individual approaches to the classroom and innovative teaching content and methods. Nevertheless, teachers within the existing context can offer their students age-appropriate ways to interrogate collective memory, and investigate the various truths contained

within multiple historical narratives. One method for doing so is through field studies using historic sites, memorials, and monuments as primary sources. The National Mall—with its wealth of memorials, monuments, museums, and historic sites—is considered the gold standard against which all other public lands are measured, welcoming over 24 million visitors from around the world each year (National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/mall/faqs.htm). But, to what extent does the Mall offer explicit instructional value to classroom students and teachers? Is it sufficient to bus 8th grade students 800 miles to stand at the base of a monument and say, "Kids, this is important because it is here?"

The Educational Value of Historic Sites and Memorials

All public sites of history are interpreted in some way by the entities that elect to preserve them (Young 1993). Memorials are different from the childhood home of an historic figure or a battlefield, because they tend to be symbolic and stylized representations of a person or event rather than the authentic physical places of history (National atlas.gov, 2012). Unlike a museum that may include a variety of objects and potentially contradictory information about the history being referenced, a memorial tends to take a singular—usually positive—perspective (Lowenthal 1985). Regardless of the type of historic site, the very existence and preservation of the site suggests a collective (if not universal) statement of its historical significance, and its lasting value in the telling of the story of a community or a nation. By their very existence, these sites invite the question, "Why is this [still] here?" It is this question—"why? "– that makes historic sites and memorials intrinsically educational.

Field studies at historic sites provide the classroom teacher and K–12 students another way of interrogating the past using historical thinking skills. Such field studies address the emotions that are likely to emerge from the very act of placing oneself into the physical space where historical actors lived, worked, worshiped, died, and/or are celebrated (Vascellaro, 2011). Field studies incorporate the powerful ways that a visit to historic places "give concrete meaning to our history and our lives as no spoken or written word alone can do (Horton, 2000)" and help visitors "feel connected to the past. . .because authentic artifacts seem to transport them straight back to the times when history was being made. (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998, p. 12).

A teacher who takes seriously the task of linking the teaching of U.S. national history to student democratic practices within and outside of the classroom (Deardorff, Mvusi, McLemore, & Kolnick, 2005, p. 23) will embrace any and every opportunity to visit historic sites, memorials, and museums in their local community, region, and the National Mall.

The Need for Informed Interpretation of Historic Sites and Memorials.

This section focuses on memorials and monuments. I want to argue that the mere existence of a memorial is not the triumphant end of a given historical story, but rather the beginning. In a sense, public memorials and monuments have the ability to offer public debate that is well reasoned, articulate, and edifying. Through interpretation, effective technologies, partnerships, and humility, memorials might offer a more challenging, and also more interesting, venue for engaging classroom students in historical thinking than, perhaps, a museum (apologies to the Smithsonian Institution museums, all personal favorites).

Interpretation. If a person or event is worthy of representation, it is worthy of good and active interpretation as well. People and events of historical significance must be placed in a context for understanding, and perhaps appreciation, for future generations. If we truly want to honor the people and events that shaped our present and which may serve as guides to our collective future, we must offer representations that are more than resting places for migratory birds.

Effective Technologies. If democracy has value, and we want to instill in children and youth the habits of democracy, we cannot leave this to chance; the habits must be part of the design and engineering of our memorials and monuments using whatever communications and instructional technologies are available and, most importantly, are effective. One example is the National Park Service website, Teaching with Historic Places (http://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/), which allows people to access the National Mall using virtual technology before, after, or instead of a visit to Washington DC.

Partnerships. As a teacher prepares students for a field study, the teacher has three important roles: to identify students' prior knowledge and important vocabulary that will help students understand what they might see and experience; to act as an observer on-site; and to help students engage in post-visit interpretation and meaning-making. Similarly, the on-site interpreter must be knowledgeable about

the historical significance of the site, the controversies concerning the history that is being represented, the value of age-appropriate responses to student queries, and follow-up resources for classroom use. Effective partnerships can be formal and arranged prior to a field study. However, education professionals know to be ready for spontaneous moments of insight and how to support one another with age-appropriate extensions for student learning.

Humility. The permanence of monuments can create embarrassing anachronisms and errors; one recent (and costly) example is the public outrage following the poor and misleading editing of a quote from Dr. Martin Luther King on the King Memorial that implies that he boastfully perceived himself to be a drum major for justice, rather than a humble servant of the people's desires for justice. Therefore, some questions to discuss with a class could be: Who can make mistakes? How do we correct the mistakes that we make as individuals, as leaders, as governments? How do we avoid hurting people before we make big mistakes?

Two examples of how interpretation, effective technologies, partnerships, and humility can work together to create historical thinking opportunities for classroom teachers and students are the National World War II Memorial and the Vietnam Memorial.

The National World War II Memorial is potentially an all-encompassing memorial to all of the U.S heroes of the War. In his opening statement, to the 105th Congress concerning the Commemorative Works Act, Sen. Craig Thomas, R–WY stated: "To my knowledge, no one objects to a World War II Memorial. That is not the issue. The issue is the process and the location. These are legitimate public questions because they affect not only history and the military, but specifically they are also place on public lands and should have the input of any interested public party." (Commemorative Works Act, 105th Congress).

Fierce debate ensued up to and beyond its opening in 2004 concerning its process and location, its design and its omissions (Shea, 2001; Benton-Short, 2006). In an American University graduate anthropology classes on memory and remembrance, two students created a video of the interpretations and emotions of adult visitors to the World War II memorial to explore the "missing memories" (Schafft, 2010). Using this background information, a colleague and I explored the memorial with an eye toward how an elementary classroom teacher might bring students to the memorial and engage in historical thinking.

We used the basic technology of observation, pen and paper note taking, and close review of the *bas reliefs* and symbols to ask each other questions about the size, construction, and "message" of the Memorial. We joined a National Park Service ranger-led tour. Once his formal talk ended, the ranger conceded that, "No one had ever brought up the lack of diversity at the memorial before" our probing. No, the implied battles did not include the annihilation of Nagasaki and Hiroshima; yes, the soldiers all tend to look Caucasian; no, the Russians are not listed among our allies. When asked how he would share the memorial with elementary school students, he mentioned two stories that "always capture the attention of students" regarding Maidenform bras, hot airplane seats and underwear. In the process of asking hard questions, we were sensitive to the fact that we were not conforming, that we were creating discomfort, and that "no one " questions war memorials because it is, at best rude, and at worst unpatriotic. If a classroom teacher of questioning elementary students were to face the same discomfort, would there be room for the teacher and the interpreter to create a partnership to transform the experience into an exercise in age-appropriate critical historical thinking?

Among the things to see, think and wonder about the memorial, students may observe the absence of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics among the Allies; the absence of Tuskegee Airmen and the presence of the majority of enlisted African Americans and women doing menial work below their capabilities; and the absence of American Indian, Asian (especially Japanese) American and Latino enlisted persons. A follow-up activity could be to create plaques of forgotten people and places, including the Los Alamos site of nuclear weapons test site.

A critical question to explore with students might be why war memorials exist (Trofanenko, 2010). Is the purpose of commemorating wars to create a general cemetery when there are no specific remains; or to observe the national decision about how and why a war was declared? To explore these questions with young children is entirely age-appropriate, as they regularly perceive history as predominately violent, and identify historical people as those "dying in a famous way" (Levstik, 2008b, p. 54).

In a recent Memorial Day interview with Howard Hatton, a Vietnam War veteran, we discussed the memorial known as The Wall. Following his 16-month tour of duty in Danang, Mr. Hatton returned home to California alive and uninjured, to a loving family, and a successful career. Three years later, he visited The Wall,

identifying several of his friends and comrades among the casualties. It was an emotional experience and he has not visited it in subsequent trips to Washington. Mr. Hatton has 8 grandchildren, ages 2—21 and predicts that they would not have even a fraction of his emotional response by visiting the Wall, absent any historical context. As their tour guide, he would share his observations that low-income Blacks and Latinos were more often placed on the front lines in Vietnam and died and were injured in disproportionate numbers; and the experiences of African Americans in prior wars (for example, his uncle did not want to return to the States following his experience in the Korean War due to his experience of racism in the U.S.).

On such a field visit, he would want his grandchildren to get more than printed literature: instead, he would want them to engage with audio and video material that offer the context for the war; to have an opportunity to talk honestly with a knowledgeable interpreter who knows something about the history of the Vietnam War, and about the nature of war in general; to grasp the magnitude of the casualties by taking in all the names; and so on.

In addition, the Wall provokes lingering questions for Mr. Hatton. He wonders if the existence of the Wall is a reflection of the social unrest of the time? Why was it erected before the World War II memorial? Was it because we "won" World War II?

These are the kinds of questions that are part of historical thinking and which can be answered through humble interpretation, effective instructional technologies, and partnerships between schools and sites, for a Vietnam veteran, his 8 grandchildren, and any school visitors 100 years from now who seek understanding of the v-shaped black granite wall on the National Mall.

All of the stories—the ugly, the beautiful, the bitter and the bold—all of the stories of the formation, democratization, evolution and hopes for the United States deserve to be told. The National Mall is one of the most important sites for the telling of these stories. To be satisfying and instructive, the stories must come to resolution following the initial, "Once upon a time, there was a (person, place or thing) that occupied this spot." I attempt to argue here that a humble offering of interpretation, effective technologies, and partnerships completes the story.

References

Aguilar, E. (2010, Apr 8). How to Engage Young Students in Historical Thinking 4/8/10 http://www.edutopia.org/historical-thinking-skills-K–6

Barton, K.C. (2008). Making connections, in Researching History Education: Theory, Method, and Context, (L.S. Levstik & K.S. Barton, eds), pp. 148—158, New York, London: Routledge.

Barton, K. and Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Benton-Short, L. (2006). Politics, Public Space and Memorials: The Brawl on the Mall, Urban Geography, 27(4), pp. 297–329:

Biggers, J. "Who's Afraid of 'The Tempest'?" Arizona's Ban on Ethnic Studies Proscribes Mexican-American History, Local Authors, Even Shakespeare. Salon.com. Retrieved Friday, January 13, 2012.

Brophy, J. Alleman, J. & Knighton, B. (2009). Inside the social studies classroom, New York: Routledge.

Brophy, J. and Van Sledright, B. (1997). *Teaching and learning history in elementary school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cess-Newsome, J. (2002). Secondary teachers' knowledge and beliefs about subject matter and their impact on instruction, in *Examining pedagogical content knowledge,* edited by Gess-Newsome, J. and Lederman, N.G., Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, pp. 51—94.

Commemorative Works Act, September 11, 1997, 105th Congress

Cooper, J.J. Arizona Ethnic Studies Law Signed by Governor Brewer, Condemned by U.N. Human Rights Experts. Huffington Post, retrieved May 26, 2010. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/Arizona-ethnic-studies-la_n_572864.html

De La Paz, S., Malkus, N., Monte-Sano, C., Montanaro, E. (2011). "Evaluating American History Teachers' Professional Development: Effects on Student Learning." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 39(4), pp. 494–540.

Deardorff, M.D., Mvusi, T.R.M., McLemore, L.B., & Kolnick, J. (2005). The Fannie Lou Hamer National Institute on citizenship and democracy: Engaging a curriculum and pedagogy, in *The history teacher, 38(4),* pp. 441–453.

Edmonds, M., Hull, J. Janik, E. & Rylance, K. (2005) *History and critical thinking: A handbook for using historical documents to improve students' thinking skills in the secondary grades.* Madison: Wisconsin Historical Society.

Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities.* New York: Routledge.

Fitchett, P.G. & Heafner, T L. (2010, Winter). A national perspective of the effects of high-stakes testing and standardization on elementary social studies marginalization. In Theory and Researcy in Social Education. 38(1), 114–130.
FoxNews.com. "America's Future Texas Board of Education Adopts New Social Studies, History Guidelines Published May 21, 2010
Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York & London: Continuum.
Gaudelli, W. (2002). "U.S. Kids Don't Know U.S. history: The NAEP Study, Perspectives, and Presuppositions." *The Social Studies,* 93(5), 197—201.
Gillis, J. R., ed. (1994). *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
Gruber, S. (2006). Teaching within history's reach: Teacher positionality, student identify, and revised classroom practices, in *Social change in diverse teaching contexts: touchy subjects and routine practices,* edited by Barron, N., Grimm, N. and Gruber, S. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 103–124.
Hall, T. & Scott, R. (2007). Closing the gap between professors and teachers: "Uncoverage" as a model of professional development for history teachers, in *History teacher,* 40, pp, 257–263.
Hatton, H. (May 27, 2012). Personal Interview with former lance corporal in Danang, Vietnam during 1968–69, El Cerrito, CA.
Historical Thinking Matters (2011). http://historicalthinkingmatters.org, accessed July 28, 2011
Horton, J.O. (2000). On-Site Learning: the power of historic places, in *CRM* 23(8), pp. 4–5
Humphrey, D., Chang-Ross, C., Donnelly, M.B., Hersh, L., & Skolnik, H. (2005). *Evaluation of the Teaching American History Program.* Under contract to the U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. Washington, DC.
Kapavik, R.D.R. (2006). Interrupting traditional social studies classrooms: Perspectives of U.S. history teachers, unpublished dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
King, J.T. (2009, Spring). Teaching and learning about controversial issues: Lessons from Northern Ireland, in Theory and Research in Social Education, 37(2), pp. 215–246.
Levstik, L. S. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance, in Stearns, P., Seixas, P, Wineburg, S (Eds.) *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives.* New York: NYU Press, pp. 284–305. ng, *Phi Delta Kappan,* 76, p. 591–96.
Levstik, L.S. (2008a). Historical response and narrative, in Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2008). Researching history education: Theory, method and context. New York: Routledge, pp. 10-29.
Levstik, L.S., (2008b). "Building a sense of history in a first-grade classroom," in Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2008). Researching history education: Theory, method and context. New York: Routledge, pp. 30—60.
Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2008). "They still use some of their past": Historical salience in elementary children's chronological thinking, in Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2008). Researching history education: Theory, method and context. New York: Routledge, pp. 108—147
Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Lui, Y., Shen, J., Warren, W.J., & Cowart, L. (2006). Assessing the factorial structure of high school history teachers' perceptions on teaching American history, in *Teacher development,* 10(3), pp. 379–391.
Maestri, M. (2006). The myth of a multicultural curriculum: An analysis of New York State U.S. history regents. *History teacher,* 39, pp. 381–402.
Martin, D. (2011, Jan. 10). What is Historical Thinking?, Teachinghistory.org, National History Education Clearinghouse, http://teachinghistory.org/nhec-blog/24434
McDiarmid, G.W., & Vinten-Johansen, P. (2000). A catwalk across the great divide: Redesigning the history teaching methods course, in *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international Perspectives,* edited by Stearns, P., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. New York: New York University Press.
Mohr, J. (2011). Personal interview with National Park Service Ranger, March 28, 2011, National World War II Memorial, Washington, DC.
Morton, D. (2000). Teaching and learning history in Canada, in *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international Perspectives,* edited by Stearns, P., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. New York: New York University Press.

National Atlas.gov A national memorial, monument, park. . .what's the difference? Retrieved on March 22, 2012 from http://www.nationalatlas.gov/articles/government/a_nationalparks.html

National Center for History in the Schools—UCLA, (2011). Historical Thinking Standards: http://nchs.ucla.edu/Standards/historical-thinking-standards-1/overview accessed July 28, 2011

Noggin Strain (2011, May 20). Field Studies, not Field Trips, Noggin Strain: Observations about education and politics. Friday, May 20, 2011 http://nogginstrain.blogspot.com/2011/05/field-studies-not-field-trips.html, accessed July 28, 2011

Palardy, G.J. & Rumberger. R.W. (2008). Teacher effectiveness in first grade: The importance of background qualifications, attitudes, and instructional practices for student learning, in *Educational evaluation and policy analysis,* 30(2), pp. 111–140.

Ragland, R. (2007) Changing secondary teachers' views of teaching American history *History teacher, 40,* pp. 219–246.

Ravitch, D. (2000). The educational background of history teachers, in *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international Perspectives,* edited by Stearns, P., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. New York: New York University Press.

_____. (2003). The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn. New York: Knopf.

_____. (2004). A *consumer's guide to high school history textbooks.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Rosenzweig, R. & Thelen, D. (1998). *The presence of the past: Popular uses of history in American life.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Schweber, S. (2006, January-February) "'Holocaust Fatigue': Teaching It Today." Social Education, 45—55.

Schafft, G. (2001) Displaying discrediting history in public sites, CRM 5

_____. (2004). From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

_____. (2010). Reading the Subaltern in American Monuments. http://subalternmonuments.blogspot.com/

Seixas, P. (1997, Jan). Mapping the terrain of historical significance Social Education. Vol. 61, Iss. 1; pg. 22–28.

Shea, C. (2001). The Brawl on the Mall, in *Preservation,* National Coalition to Save our Mall: http://www.savethemall.org/media/brawl.html

Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P. C. & Wineburg, S.S. (2000). *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives,* New York: New York University Press.

Teaching with Historic Places—A program of the National Park Service. http://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/

Trofanenko, B.M. (2010, Spring). The educational promise of public history museum exhibits, in Theory and Research in Social Education, 38(2), 270—288.

Van Hover, Stephanie. 2008. The professional development of social studies teachers, in L. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (eds.) *Handbook of research in social studies education,* New York: Routledge Press, pp. 352—372

VanSledright, B.A. (1995). " I don't remember—the ideas are all jumbled in my head"—8th graders' reconstructions of colonial American history. *Journal of curriculum and supervision, 10,* pp. 317—45.

_____. (2000). Can ten year olds learn to investigate history as historians do? Organization of American Historians: http://www.oah.org/pubs/nl/2000aug/vansledright.html retrieved September 13, 2011

_____. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy.* New York: Routledge

Vascellaro, S. (2011). Out of the classroom and into the world: Learning from field trips, educating from experience, and unlocking the potential of our students and teachers. New York: New Press

View, J.L. "Critical Teaching of History: Toward a Human Rights Agenda for Pre and In-Service Teacher Education." In Democracy and Multicultural Education. Farideh Salili and Rumjahn Hoosain, eds. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 149–172, 2010.

View, J.L. & Schafft, G. (under review). Hidden/Forbidden Stories at Public Sites: Teaching Difficult Histories without Fear and in Age-Appropriate Ways

Waters, T. (2005) Why students think there are two kinds of American history, *History teacher, 39,* pp. 11–21.

Young, J. (1993). The Texture of Memory. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I appreciate all of you giving your oral testimony as well as the written testimony that is part of the record.

We will now turn to the Committee for questions. Mr. Grijalva, if you would like to start off.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me start with Dr. View, welcome, let me extend the welcome to your parents that accompanied you as well.

In your written testimony, you discuss memorials as sometimes only telling the rosy side of the story of history. How do you feel we can better deal with this issue as a nation of diverse people that we are?

Dr. VIEW. In the written testimony, I state that memorials tend to be more static than museums that have rolling exhibits, and they continue to rethink the nature of the story the museum is trying to tell. A memorial tends to be a stone that is sort of carved in stone.

Through interpretation, by committing to having people available to help interpret what people are seeing when they come to that memorial, it helps to broaden the story.

As we learn more as historians, gather more data, as the kids at a memorial ask the hard questions, it provokes a dialogue, it promotes a debate, and helps to broaden our understanding of why someone decided 50 years ago it was important to put this memorial here, why it continues to stand, and what its historical significance is for the future.

Mr. GRIJALVA. You mentioned as well the changing role. Explain the changing role of informal education in these public spaces and places that we have.

Dr. VIEW. I think I mentioned in my testimony the need for humility. When we design and commit to a memorial, we might have one vision of its importance, and then as we learn more about that part of history or that person in history, we might discover new information that needs to be told.

I do not think we should think of memorials as sort of triumphant statements of a story that has ended. It is the beginning of a story. That is part of how historians approach the nature of their academic work, and certainly educators, continuing to learn more information that they share with young people.

I think as builders of memorials and monuments and museums, we should be more humble, too, in terms of how we design them, how we expect to interpret them, how we share them with future generations.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Last question, Doctor. It is part of the discussion and conversation today—design. Does the design impact the ability to broaden the conversation about a memorial, to make it as you said more than stone?

Dr. VIEW. Necessarily so. I think to the extent we can build into the design the kind of interpretation that we are talking about, the kinds of educational opportunities I am talking about, that makes sense.

Technologies change, so then we revisit the design, or if we are stuck with a bad design, that begins a conversation as well. That begins a debate as well. Why was this designed the way it was de-

signed, how could it better represent the history that we are trying to tell?

It is all part of an ongoing conversation. I do not think we should ever see any of these things as permanent and static and immovable, lacking any opportunity of deepening our understanding.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes, possibly do not get trapped in one cookie cutter?

Dr. VIEW. Exactly.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Mr. Luebke, the Trust for the National Mall is preparing all this extensive work on the Mall, on the grounds itself. How is your organization engaged so that there is a smooth process that occurs during this work?

Mr. LUEBKE. I am sorry. I missed the key phrase. Could you repeat the question?

Mr. GRIJALVA. The extensive amount of work on the Mall that we are preparing for, how are you engaged to ensure there is going to be a smooth process?

Mr. LUEBKE. The Commission of Fine Arts, of course, reviews these projects as they come to us through our review process.

We also participate extensively with the Park Service and other agencies in discussing all these projects in some minute detail all the way through, well before it actually even comes before the Commission for review.

With our partners such as NCPC, the District of Columbia's Historic Preservation Office, a lot of issues are actually vetted in terms of historical preservation values, environmental impact.

I think generally we are trying to assess, the Commission of Fine Arts perhaps more so, how these elements fit into a larger continuity of design of the national capital, particularly the Mall.

I guess the answer is everything that is being proposed is eventually going to be coming through fairly close scrutiny in all steps of the process.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. I have a few questions as well. Mr. Whitesell, once again, we welcome you here. You are the representative of the National Park Service, so in some respects, you are going to have to pay for the sins of your agency.

In April 2009, I requested documents that related to the operations of the Grand Canyon National Park. Subsequently, the Administration withheld 399 pages from us, erroneously citing a FOIA exemption.

I along with Chairman Hastings requested those same 399 pages last month and requested they be delivered today.

Do you have the 399 pages we requested three years ago?

Mr. WHITESELL. I do not, sir. I understand the Department has received the request and they are in the process of reviewing it.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it another three years we are waiting then? We only have two year terms here.

Mr. WHITESELL. I understand.

Mr. BISHOP. On April 5 of this year, I sent a written request as a follow up to our hearing on the Eisenhower Memorial. When am I going to receive a response to those questions?

Mr. WHITESELL. I will check and will be happy to get back to you, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Once again, we only have two year terms. Let me ask another question that deals with the Commemorative Works Act.

What are the risks of exempting the CWA in the process of Mall proposals?

Mr. WHITESELL. I am sorry?

Mr. BISHOP. What are the risks of exempting CWA in the process of reviewing Mall proposals?

Mr. WHITESELL. I think we would be in a position where Congress would be asked to have to evaluate these without the benefit of having the input of the Commission of Fine Arts and National Capital Planning Commission.

The result would be, I suspect, tying up Congress in endless number of hearings and comments that are currently handled through administrative processes.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me follow up on that with Mr. Bryant at the same time. Could you just elaborate on the significance of the reserve and why the 2003 amendment to the CWA was important to the future of the Mall?

Mr. BRYANT. Reflecting on your own comments, Mr. Chairman, you found it important that for the National Mall, not only that we reserve the open space and respect the nature of it from past generations but we also look to reserve for future generations and their memorials.

In our process, building on what Mr. Whitesell said, when a project comes before us, under the law, under CWA, there is mandated an early consultation process with stakeholders. You have to do that.

When a project comes before the National Capital Planning Commission, it is a multi-tiered process. First, they come to us with a conceptual design where they get feedback and the public can also respond.

They come back months later with a refined concept for preliminary approval, where the public gets to respond and provide feedback as well.

Perhaps months later, they come back to us a third time for a final approval.

Each step along the way, they get feedback. We have a staff of 45 architects, engineers, planners, historic preservation specialists and others.

Following up on Mr. Whitesell's comment, what is at risk is perhaps you not having that level of expertise and months and months of months of technical interaction.

Mr. BISHOP. How long does that process usually take? I know we are talking about longer than two year terms, are we not?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, four times that. The average for a memorial to be approved is about eight years. Of course, that depends on a number of factors, how complex it is, how big it is, how controversial it might be, as well as funding, mix of public versus private funding.

If there is a significant amount of private funding, you get into fund raising and anything can impact that.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Luebke, can I ask the basic general question to you as well on the CWA process, how can exemptions from that Act have unintended consequences?

Mr. LUEBKE. I think it is an excellent question, Mr. Chairman. The Commemorative Works Act establishes sort of a litany test and a process for all applicants to go through. The proposal is actually measured against that law.

The Memorial Advisory Commission considers each of these and then returns to Congress with advice.

The danger is, I think, it probably is best described as a hazard of precedent setting that undermines the very intent of the law, to control and be very careful about what is authorized and gets placed in this incredibly important national setting.

The issue is it may feel cumbersome. It is trying to be a one-size-fits-all process for a range of memorials, which might go from a plaque to a huge national war memorial.

It has some flexibility to accommodate this kind of change in scope.

I think really the issue is running around an existing body of regulations makes it very difficult to enforce it later.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I appreciate that. I have some other questions but my time has expired. I will come back again.

Mr. Grijalva?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shubow, you seem to be ignoring the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, in your recognition and your comments regarding the Mall.

Can you give me some of the reasons for your plan to ignore the work of these other organizations?

Mr. SHUBOW. I do not intend to ignore them at all. In fact, I would rely on some of their great successes in the past, and in its earliest years, the Commission of Fine Arts was the main institution stewarding the McMillan plan.

In fact, one of their great successes was opposing the first design for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, which were 150 foot concrete slabs that looked like instant stone hedge.

At the time, the Commission of Fine Arts still understood the importance of the classical tradition in D.C., and we believe they could do so again.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Presently, you feel they do not?

Mr. SHUBOW. It is a mixed bag. Sometimes they weigh in appropriately and sometimes I think they ignore that classical tradition. This is representative of unfortunately some fashionable trends in the world of art and architecture.

Just think of how you go to an art museum and you see a shark in formaldehyde. There is something similar going on in the world of architecture and the Commission of Fine Arts sometimes reflects that unfortunate mainstream.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Running the risk of being out of touch, let me ask another question. Some of the monuments that you propose in this retro classic style that you think is the only way to go, how are these inclusive and how do they tell the story of America today?

I understand when you memorialize someone, it is admiration and a level of hero worship.

How do we see the complexity of these people? The issue of style and design, how do we deal with those two questions, to be more inclusive and to deal with the complexity of what we are trying to memorialize and keep as part of our nation's legacy here on this Mall?

Mr. SHUBOW. I would note that the classical tradition is extremely inclusive. Examples of this are the African American Civil War Memorial, the Statute of Freedom at the top of the Capitol Dome, which is inspired by Native American tradition. Likewise, the Crazy Horse Monument.

All of these speak to our ideals, and I would say our tradition is the best one for memorializing our greatest figures.

In contrast to what Dr. View said, I would think that for certain figures, such as Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Eisenhower, we do not want too much disagreement in our memorials. We want to say a few simple things, that we should honor them and reflect on what they did for us.

What we do not want to see is the so-called "brown bag memorial" where every visitor brings whatever interpretation they want to it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This debate is endless. I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me follow up on it, if I could, Mr. Shubow. The Commemorative Works Act does not require classicism. Do you believe the Act should be amended to do that?

Mr. SHUBOW. Well, first I would say it does require classicism. In fact, one thing that has not been mentioned by the other panelists is the implicit purpose of the Commemorative Works Act, if I may quote, "The purpose of this chapter is to preserve the integrity of the comprehensive design of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans for the nation's capital."

Since those designs are classical, there is no doubt that the Commemorative Works Act requires future buildings to be classical.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Dr. View, this is almost a flippant question. You made a good point when you said the question was why was Vietnam done before World War II.

Mr. Grijalva and I both have no answer to that. Do you have an answer to it?

Dr. VIEW. I am afraid I do not.

Mr. BISHOP. Darn good question. Thank you. Let me go back if I could to Mr. Bryant just for a second.

As you know, the design for the Eisenhower Memorial, for example, is becoming increasingly controversial.

In the CWA process, it requires or uses the term "consensus" and the concept of what is durable.

Can you make some observations that can help Congress to improve its authorizing process in the future based on the lessons we have learned from this controversy?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes. It does encourage consensus, and we as a commission have constantly been concerned about the consensus, and encouraging consensus among the parties.

We have been pleased that the dialogue has continued. At one point, the Eisenhower Memorial application may have been before us several months ago, but has been delayed so the parties could continuing talking.

You are correct that part of the Commemorative Works Act has us look at the durability of materials, and that is one question that I personally had, as to how these materials will stand up in a life cycle analysis and over the test of decades.

The architects are continuing to work and to test the materials to answer those questions.

The last part of your question is what can we learn from this process and how can it be perhaps improved. There has been a Joint Task Force on Memorials. It worked from 2000 to 2002 to answer or review that very question, how can the process be continually improved.

One of the recommendations coming out of that task force was indeed to create a reserve. We are concerned about over building on the Mall, create the reserve where no additional monuments can be built.

That was an example of the process improving from the task force.

I would submit that if you are looking for a vehicle to construct a dialogue about continuing to improve the process, that task force may be a good vehicle to do so.

Mr. BISHOP. Realizing I am running out of time, are there additional suggestions of that task force that have not been implemented?

Mr. BRYANT. I would have to get back to you on that.

Mr. BISHOP. If you would, I would appreciate it.

Let me follow up, Mr. Luebke, on the point you made earlier about the concept of durability. How indeed does one measure durability as required by the CWA?

Mr. LUEBKE. Well, that is a question that is fundamentally a technical one, which would be answered through materials studies. If you are referring to the Eisenhower Memorial, of course, this kind of thing is being undertaken.

It is less of an issue when you are talking about building with solid masonry, for example, as opposed to other materials, glass, other metals, et cetera.

I did want to make a point that the Commission does not actually determine the style of what comes before it. It is a review agency. Therefore, it is not in a position—I do not think the Commission considers itself as imposing a style, although it does defend the resources that we have, many of which are classical.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, that I think is very important to make, and I know it is unpleasant sometimes, but all these national memorials, almost all, are incredibly controversial, usually involving years of debate.

This is true of the Lincoln Memorial. President Roosevelt had intervened on the Jefferson Memorial. Roosevelt's own memorial took 38 years to come to a successful completion.

We are sort of used to the idea that there is going to be a debate, and in some ways I think the debate is probably healthy for our democracy.

Mr. BISHOP. I would agree with that last statement, it probably is healthy.

Mr. Grijalva has no more questions. Let me just go over my time limit here and ask a couple more and then we can probably conclude this.

Mr. Shubow, if I could follow up on that as far as the question about the process, especially when you consider the Eisenhower project, have you all determined where in the process a change could be made to trigger a more desirable design outcome? I do not know if that makes sense to you.

Procedurally, has your group procedurally said we are in the process, we could make some kind of change to trigger those changes?

Mr. SHUBOW. Sure. There are a few cases where that could take place. The Commission of Fine Arts could follow its noble tradition and find that the memorial is discordant with the best of Washington's monuments. They have done so repeatedly in the past and they can do so again.

There is no way you could describe this post-modern design as fitting in with the rest of the National Mall.

Another way that this process could be resolved happily is for the National Capital Planning Commission or the Commission of Fine Arts to find that the memorial's materials are not permanent, as is required by the statute authorizing a memorial.

One of the main if not the main feature of the memorial is an enormous steel screen. Steel is not as permanent as say stone, and even the architects and the Eisenhower Memorial Commission, who were behind it, have said they are doing testing to ensure that the screen lasts 100 years.

Well, 100 years is far short of permanent. In addition, the screen will acquire extensive maintenance to make sure it is durable throughout the ages.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me try to zero in just a little bit more on that question. I only have a couple more for Mr. Whitesell and I will be done.

Where in the path of making the decisions, leading up to those decisions, could have been a time when you could impose a change in the process so you could have changed the direction the design process was going? I am asking a procedural question here.

Mr. SHUBOW. I would say if you go all the way back to the original statute authorizing the memorial, and in fact, when Congress authorized the FDR Memorial, they specifically said it must be harmonious with the Lincoln, Jefferson, and Washington Monuments.

Something like that would have solved these problems.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I realize I am asking a convoluted question and I am not stating it very well. I appreciate your response to that.

Mr. Whitesell, I have two last questions for you. The first one deals with the work you are doing on the Mall right now. I realize you are doing considerable work on the Mall turf, which has had an unusually detrimental impact on my softball season this year.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. I would simply like to know when it is going to be completed and actually will it benefit the games in the future.

Mr. WHITESELL. The current work on the Mall turf is only a portion of that envisioned for that project. The piece that is underway

right now is from 3rd to 7th Street. That is supposed to be completed by the end of this calendar year.

As to how it will affect your softball game, I cannot say, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. At my age, nothing can improve my game.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. The playing conditions are the significant part. Could you just give us a brief update on previously authorized Mall programs?

Mr. WHITESELL. In terms of construction projects?

Mr. BISHOP. Where they are in the process.

Mr. WHITESELL. For instance, the Reflecting Pool is under reconstruction right now, and should be completed by the first week in August, according to the engineers on that project.

We are in the process of developing the plans for the restoration and rehabilitation of the Washington Monument, which of course was damaged by last year's earthquake.

Those are the two principal ones that are underway.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Noem, I appreciate you joining us here. Did you have any questions?

Mrs. NOEM. No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you for being part of this hearing.

I want to thank the witnesses for their testimony. I ask all the witnesses to be prepared to respond in writing to any questions that may be submitted by members of the Subcommittee in a timely fashion.

I further ask—I do not further ask because we do not have that part in my agenda—we are done here.

Without objection and without further questions or further business, this Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:08 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

Statement submitted for the record by Representative Sam Farr (CA–17), Returned Peace Corps Volunteer, Colombia, 1964–66

Thank you to Chairman Bishop and Ranking Member Grijalva for the opportunity to submit my testimony in support of H.R. 854, the Peace Corps Commemorative legislation. I represent California's 17th District and I was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Medellin, Colombia. I introduced this bill with Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Members of Congress Representatives Thomas Petri (WI–6) who served in Somalia, Mike Honda (CA–15) who served in El Salvador, and John Garamendi (CA–10) who served in Ethiopia.

The Peace Corps Commemorative legislation is a cost-free, bipartisan bill that authorizes the non-profit Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a modest commemorative on Federal land in our nation's capital to honor the formation of the Peace Corps and the ideals of world peace and friendship upon which it was founded. The founding of the Peace Corps was a seminal moment in American history that deserves recognition in our nation's capital.

The historic L'Enfant and McMillan Plans for the nation's capital provided a blueprint for the City of Washington to evolve as an enduring symbol of American identity. Peace Corps is the great American idea of the 20th century that truly reflects what it means to be an American—in service to our nation for the betterment of humankind. It is an important component of our national identity that reflects our highest value of peace. This ideal deserves to be honored here in the capital of the United States, and passage of H.R. 854 would make that possible.

Fifty-one years ago, President Kennedy ushered in a new era of American service when he signed the Executive Order establishing the Peace Corps: "Our Peace Corps is not designed as an instrument of diplomacy or propaganda or ideological conflict. It is designed to permit our people to exercise more fully their responsibilities in

the great common cause of world development." While the international community was fractured by Cold War tensions, the founding of the Peace Corps marked a moment in time that reflected the best of what America had to offer the world: service to others in the common cause of global peace, mutual understanding, grassroots development, and prosperity. With the creation of the Peace Corps, America showed the world that we are a partner for progress, a new kind of force in the world guided by peace and goodwill. Our country has never been the same and the world was changed—for the good—forever.

As historian Doris Kearns Goodwin noted, the founding of the Peace Corps "has produced an enduring legacy of service in the cause of peace, a timeless symbol of America's most honorable ideals and aspirations." Over the past 51 years, through war and conflict, nearly a quarter million Americans from all 50 states have served in 139 developing countries, embodying the timeless American ideals of goodwill, friendship, prosperity, and progress. Today, the 9,095 Peace Corps Volunteers serving in 75 developing countries continue to live out these ideals and demonstrate the enduring significance of Peace Corps' founding. A modest commemorative on Federal land is an appropriate way to mark the moment that America formally established its commitment to service in the cause of peace.

Peace Corps was profoundly meaningful in my life as well. It gave me purpose; it focused my heart and mind on the problems associated with the culture of poverty, abroad and here at home. But it will not just be the 200,000 Returned Volunteers or the millions of family members and friends of Peace Corps Volunteers who will be able to reflect on this great American idea with this commemorative. Peace Corps Volunteers have partnered with tens of millions of individuals around the world, and this commemorative honors the moment in American history when those important partnerships and bonds of friendship first began.

As President Kennedy said in his last State of the Union address, "Nothing carries the spirit of American idealism and expresses our hopes better and more effectively to the far corners of the earth than the Peace Corps." It is now time that we have that idealism expressed in our nation's Capital as well.

This legislation has robust support both inside and outside of Congress. H.R. 854 has 156 bipartisan cosponsors; over a third of the House of Representatives wants to see this legislation enacted. But this legislation has also been favorably reviewed by the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission. In addition, on October 4, 2011, at this Subcommittee's hearing on H.R. 854, Stephen Whitesell, National Capital Region Regional Director for the National Park Service (NPS), stated in his testimony: "We [NPS] share the [National Capital Memorial Advisory] Commission's support for the idea of commemorating volunteerism and international cooperation as worthy ideals and practice of the Peace Corps."

In addition, S. 1421, similar bipartisan legislation introduced by Senators Portman and Mark Udall, passed the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee by voice vote on November 11, 2011. Clearly, there is robust bicameral, bipartisan support for passage of this legislation.

As you may know, this bill is a re-introduction of H.R. 4195, which passed out of the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent and passed the full House of Representatives by voice vote in the 111th Congress. The only modifications to this bill in the 112th Congress are the inclusion of a Findings Section and the addition of "ideals of world peace and friendship" to reflect the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission's suggestion that the legislation specify the ideals that the commemorative honor. At this Subcommittee's October 4th, 2011 hearing, NPS noted that the changes further strengthened the legislation. This bill is in compliance with the Commemorative Works Act, and Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

Now is an opportune time to honor and recognize on the National Mall the enduring ideals of world peace and friendship embodied in the founding of Peace Corps. I respectfully request the Subcommittee's support of this legislation to honor America's enduring commitment to world peace and friendship.

Thank you.

○