

Minutes of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission
May 14, 2004
10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Minutes prepared by Joanne Hanley, National Park Service

Meeting called to order at 10:00 AM by Joanne Hanley, Designated Federal Officer for the Commission.

Commissioners Present

Ms. Donna Glessner, Vice Chair

Mr. Jerry Guadagno

Mr. John Felt

Mr. Dan Sullivan

Mr. Michael Watson

Mr. Jerry Spangler

Mr. Gary Singel

Ms. Pamela Tokar-Ickes

Mr. Greg Walker

Dr. Ed Linenthal

Mr. Ken Nacke

Mr. Larry Catuzzi

Mr. Calvin Wilson

Mr. John Reynolds, Chair by phone

Absent:

Dr. Brent Glass

I. Opening of Meeting and Pledge of Allegiance

Joanne Hanley welcomed everyone, formally opened the third meeting of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission, and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Observation of moment of silence was held for our troops and our country.

II. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

Vice Chair Donna Glessner chaired the meeting in the absence of John Reynolds. Mr. Reynolds participated by phone. Each Commissioner introduced themselves. Ms. Glessner welcomed family members, NPS staff and the public. A special welcome was given to Amy Laboski from Congressman Shuster's office.

Ms. Glessner gave brief opening remarks. She acknowledged the success of our planning and design process, and the all the hard work that has been devoted to this effort thus far by numerous individuals, volunteers and consultants.

Ms. Hanley went over housekeeping details for the day and the format of the meeting. Public comments will be taken before each vote by the Commission, as well as at the end of the meeting. This is a change from the past when comments were saved strictly for the end of the meeting.

Ms. Hanley explained use of new microphone system. This system was put into place in response to the public, family and Commissioner feedback that it was difficult to hear.

Question from Ms. Glessner to the Commission: "Should those Commissioners who are not physically present at the meeting, be permitted to vote by telephone?" FACA rules give us that option should we wish to exercise it.

Motion 04-08 Regarding Commissioner Voting by Teleconference

Motion: Commissioners will be allowed to vote if they can only attend the meeting through teleconference.

Moved: by Commissioner Felt

Second: by Commissioner Walker

Discussion from Commissioners:

Comment from Commissioner Glessner: Concern is that it would make this too easy for Commissioners to not attend meetings.

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: Commitment from the Commission is self-evident, so that is not a major concern. There will always be emergencies. If it gets out of control, we can always re-visit this.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: Attendance record speaks for itself.

If someone is on the phone, cannot see handouts, and feels uneasy about voting they can always abstain. In good judgement, a Commissioner should abstain from voting if this happens.

Discussion from public:

None

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

Motion passes.

III. Review and Approval of Minutes

Motion 04-09 Regarding Approval of Minutes from May 14, 2004

Motion: The Commission approves the minutes of May 14, 2004, as amended.

Moved: Commissioner Catuzzi

Second: Commissioner Sullivan

Discussion from Commissioners:

Please note in the minutes that Larry Catuzzi attended the meeting by teleconference; he was not absent. Please make changes.

If someone does attend the meeting by phone, that ought to show in the minutes.

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

Motion passes.

III. Reports from the Flight 93 Memorial Task Force and the NPS

Vice-Chair Glessner thanked all of the Committees that generated so much valuable work and the wonderful reports. The information was excellent and will be the foundation of our future here. The many processes that were established will guide us through the challenges ahead.

A. Planning Process: GMP/EIS Update

Power Point Presentation by Jeff Reinbold, NPS

1. Integrated Planning Process Chart: Mr. Reinbold revised the original integrated planning process chart to better illustrate how the steps in the Design Competition and the steps in the General Management Plan/EIS process occur simultaneously (**see *attachment 1***). The 3 – 5 finalists in Phase One of the design competition will need to be studied and evaluated as alternatives in the GMP/EIS, and therefore need to be done simultaneously with the GMP/EIS. He said we are almost complete with Phase One, and are well into Phase Two. This process still gets us to the September 25, 2005 submittal date to Secretary of Interior and Congress, but it is very aggressive.

Motion 04 10

Motion: The Commission endorses the revised integrated planning process as proposed (***attachment 1***).

Moved: Commissioner Spangler

Second: Commissioner Nacke

Discussion from Commission:

Question from Commissioner Linenthal: Is there a difference between aggressive and rushed?

Answer from Mr. Reinbold: It is realistic. If anyone is going to be rushed it will be our consultants. The groundwork from the past 6 months and the relationships we have created will serve us well. We are confident in the process if we can stick to it.

Comment from Commissioner Reynolds: If we begin to feel the process is rushed rather than aggressive, it is up to us to say so, and our responsibility to make sure we are not going too fast.

Comment from Mr. Reinbold: This schedule will get us to September 2005. The question still remains if it is too fast.

Comment from Mr. Catuzzi: He reminded the Commissioners things have been allowed to slip, so while we share the concerns about rush, we need to keep our eyes on the goal.

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

Motion passes.

2. Creation of a General Management Plan Coordinating Committee: This was an issue brought up to the Executive Committee of Task Force last week. The advisors for the design solicitation are top notch, and we want to make sure that the GMP part of the process is equally successful. To do that, informal relationships need to be formalized. Many of the informal community meetings, meetings with landowners, and presentations to local organizations will accelerate in the coming months. As they do, we want to make

sure the GMP is coordinated not only internally with the partners, but with the local community as well

Help with local outreach and local coordination will be invaluable to us. To date we have been relying heavily on Barbara Black, Donna Glessner, Greg Walker, Jerry Spangler and others. We want to make sure this is systematic, and at the end of the day, the local communities, which will be neighbors to the park, are very involved in and supportive of the process and recommendations. Local Commissioners would be very valuable in this Committee.

Motion 04 11

Motion: The Commission endorses the creation of a General Management Plan Coordination Committee of the Flight 93 Memorial Task Force to ensure close coordination between the NPS, the Commission, and the partners throughout the planning process. The coordination committee is not operational nor oversight in nature, but rather advisory and coordinating in its efforts to assist the NPS in meeting its legislated and policy requirements.

Moved: Commissioner Catuzzi

Second: Commissioner Watson

Discussion:

Comment from Jeff Reinbold: The GMP is one of three things we will be bringing to the Secretary of the Interior. It is as much a product and reflection of the work of the Commission as the boundary. So as much as is practical, we should have local Commission members on the GMP Committee. Several people have already volunteered Ken Nacke, Patrick White, Jerry Spangler, Donna Glessner, and Larry Catuzzi. Commissioners Pam Tokar-Ickes and Greg Walker also volunteered. It will also be brought up at the Task Force meeting tomorrow on May 15, 2004.

Question from Commissioner Felt: Who will be formally organizing and designating members of this Committee as an official Task Force committee?

Answer from Commissioner Catuzzi: Same as we have done in the past. It will be brought up to the full Task Force tomorrow. We will ratify by acknowledging the creation of the Committee and approving members. The invitation will be made at the task force meeting for others to serve.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: Remember this is more of a "feedback, advice, and ground-truthing" group as we go into the local community.

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor, none opposed

Motion passes

3. Data Gathering for the EIS GIS maps that are being prepared by our consultant were presented to the Commission. All of the GIS maps are of the same scale and can be overlain. The following maps were shown:

- Aerial photography with property lines and boundary lines.
- Base Map: roads, boundary
- Resource Constraints Map: so far have the following – topography and contour, floodplains, wetlands, ponds, steep slopes, streams.
- Underground Mining Map showing system of mines and soil structure

- Transportation Map shows location of traffic counters, where current traffic counts are lacking. Most of the major intersections are covered, so we can develop a baseline.

B. Mission Statement/Memorial Ideas Committee

Presentation by Commissioner Jerry Spangler and by Esther Heymann.

Mr. Spangler stated that right from the beginning, we were aware that we would begin with the end in mind, and the concepts would reflect the needs of the memorial. A variety of interests were taken into account in preparing the mission statement.

Families were put first in the process. The local community, which has taken its responsibility as stewards of hallowed ground, also has a big stake. There is also a national and international interest in this. The nation has adopted this as well. All these groups have contributed.

This Committee worked at sessions with families in San Francisco, worked at Task Force sessions, and solicited input through the newsletter as well as through the website. All of the comments were gathered, and through 11 meetings of this committee, a mission statement was drafted for review. The current working draft (***see attachment 2***) is presented today. Preliminary endorsement is needed so as to move forward with it in the design competition materials. Professional writers, as well as the FBI will review it.

Motion 04 12

Motion: The Flight 93 Advisory Commission approves the working draft of the Mission Statement prepared by the Mission Statement/Memorial Ideas committee of the Task Force and authorizes its use for in the design competition. This resolution is contingent upon concurrent approval of the document at the meeting of the Task Force scheduled for May 15. Follow up editing for the purposes of clarity and factual accuracy are authorized. A vote on the approval of the final version will occur at the July 30, 2004 meeting of the commission.

Moved: Commissioner Spangler

Second: Commissioner Sullivan

Discussion from Commission:

Commissioner Linenthal: I know how hard these things are to prepare and you have done a remarkable job with this. It is a document that allows people to inhabit the meaning of this in a number of different ways, yet it is very clear. It shows the power of the event. As Commissioners, we never really sat down together and talked about the impact on the nation and the world, and the significance of the events of September 11. We have never had the opportunity and talk with each other about what we think those are. They are assumed, but in fact, we have not sat down and talked about what we think the significance is. It would be interesting to do this. I am simply in awe of what has been done.

Commissioner Nacke: You did a great job with this. We need to stress this is a work in draft.

Commissioner Watson: I have a problem with the word "authorize." Is there another word we should use? This indicates that if everyone feels it is needed, it is authorized to go ahead. I think the clarity and accuracy is already done. Maybe there is another word?

Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: As someone, who used to make his or her living by writing, I tend to wordsmith. Therefore I know how hard this was. Your words moved me. You have succeeded. Thank you.

Commissioner Wilson: We are still in the working format. It will still be reviewed again. I will ask that we pay close attention to that time period. Even though it is a working document, we must do everything in our power to have it in final form by next meeting.

Commissioner Spangler: We are looking at this from two different levels. We need it for the design competition process. We also need it for the NPS GMP and the memorial in its final form. We may have the opportunity to tweak it if something develops. But most of all, we need to get this to the printer with the design competition materials.

Commissioner Glessner: This document relates not only to the memorial that will be designed, but also to the entire property that will one day be Flight 93 National Memorial in all its aspects.

Commissioner Catuzzi: Even though we specify the design competition, we need to use it more generally for many activities. We should add breadth to the motion by more general comments vs. just design competition. I am concerned also that this motion says we will follow-up for clarity and accuracy, when you all have already done that.

Commissioner Spangler asked Commissioner Glessner to tell about the origin of the preamble to the mission statement – *“A common field one day. A field of honor forever.”*

Commissioner Glessner: It came to us in a memorial tribute that was received into the collection written by Captain Steve Ruda of the Los Angeles City Fire Department. He wrote this on a quilt that was sent to Shanksville. He never visited Shanksville. He was involved in NYC and was the media spokesperson for the Fire Dept at that time. When he was asked to express his feelings on this quilt, he penned these words in just a moment. We made contact with him, and he was thrilled to give us authorization to use them any way we wish.

Discussion from the Public:

Question from Ms. Sandy Felt: What is the next step after this working draft? Is there a process in place for review of final approval?

Answer from Commissioner Spangler: Mr. Reinbold is making arrangements for it to be reviewed by the FBI. Helene Fried will have it reviewed by a professional writer. They will then be referred back to Mission Statement Committee and run it again by Family Board and other partners.

Question from Ms. Sandy Felt: Will it be sent to all the family members?

Answer from Commissioner Spangler: Yes. Before approval.

Comment from Committee Co-Chair Esther Heymann: I am very satisfied with all the work we have done. I can't imagine that there are stones left unturned. We invited tremendous amounts of input from anybody at many junctures and on many occasions. We still are open to revisions. But please, instead of telling us you do not like a sentence, suggest a replacement. Thank you.

Revised Motion 04 12

The Flight 93 Advisory Commission approves the working draft of the Mission Statement prepared by the Mission Statement/Memorial Ideas Committee of the Task Force and authorizes its use for official project related activities. This resolution is contingent upon concurrent approval of the document at the meeting of the Task Force scheduled for May 15. A vote on the approval of the final version will occur at the July 30, 2004 meeting of the commission.

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.
Motion passes.

C. Design Solicitation Committee

Presentation by Tim Baird and Gina Farfour.

The video for the design competition package is coming along. The storyboard is being developed. Family member Dave Cushing is heading up that effort. It is now more of a documentary to tell more of the history of the land and the region, rather than the story of the day. That way, we won't be leading any potential designer in one direction or another, through the power of suggestion.

A grant from the Heinz Endowments has been approved for \$500,000 by their board for the design competition.

The design competition advisors are on board and have hit the ground running. The Oversight Committee is managing the day-to-day work on behalf of the Families, consisting of representatives of the partners. The start date of the competition has been moved back to September 11 of this year to get a lot of preliminary groundwork done. Decisions need to be made quickly, and the decision-making process is being refined so the Oversight Committee meets directly with the consultants.

Don Stastny is with Stastny Braun Architects in Portland, Oregon. He has paired up with Helene Fried of Helene Fried Associates in San Francisco to manage this competition. They worked on many competitions in the last couple of years, including Arts Park LA and the Oklahoma City Memorial.

Don and Helene gave a thorough and comprehensive report and overview of themselves and the process. There are four areas to talk about this morning:

1. Introductions, what they bring to the process

Don Stastny:

Don's firm has been in existence since 1975. The firm works in architecture, especially with places of memory and interpretation. They also work with urban design, planning, and building community. They also have 25-year experience in running design competitions. (Worked on design-build competition to get Kenya and Tanzania embassies back on line after they were destroyed).

He met Helene and learned from her, collaboration to bring together a number of different disciplines and interests; then take those elements and weave them together in an environment of a design competition.

Helene Fried:

Helene thanked members of Oversight Committee and all the citizens of Shanksville and Somerset who have already made us members of the community. They are on a very high learning curve. Her background is in public planning of art, cultural facilities, design competitions and education. Her work brings the arts and design to a larger public audience. She has had her consulting business since 1983 and has done a number of unusual and pioneering projects. She and Don believe strongly in having a jury made up of members of the lay public, family members, as well as professionals on a jury; this idea of which is criticized by some of my distinguished peers. They embrace public involvement.

Most of her work is with distinguished organizations that have been around for many years, as well as with starting organizations brand new.

Don and Helene collaborate. They use their combined resources in imagining how to do things better. They do not seek innovation for innovation's sake, but to see if there are better ways to do things. They are both very active in their communities, and they believe strongly in the notion of community, whether large or small.

2. Impressions of what they have seen so far

Don Stastny:

When they came for their interview, one of the questions was "were they excited about the opportunity." No, they are not excited, they are passionate about it. They foresee this as the highlight of their career, to be able to take what they know, and apply it to this very specific situation.

To carry the responsibility of telling the story, bringing it to the public, and being stewards of the site is a heavy burden. At the end, we need to wind up with something that honors those people, yet celebrates their heroism.

The site was the first strong impression. The mission preamble states it all. They drove up to the site the first morning over the rise, and saw the sky as a ceiling. Then sitting at the temporary memorial and seeing the contrails across the sky. Then looking down to the impact site and recognizing the power of this particular site; both what it has aesthetically and spiritually. They stated we all need to capture that power, and that may be our biggest challenge.

Helene Fried:

The biggest impression she had is one of all of us. How the family members come together after such a recent event and build to help us learn lessons. How citizens who already have busy lives, make the commitment we make.

3. Opportunities and challenges they see

The opportunity and challenge they see is that we are four equal partners. We are all over this country with very different ideas and expertise. How all of that comes together is both the challenge, and the opportunity.

Even though they have done this pioneering work with lay people and professionals on a jury, it is always a big challenge. It is one of the challenges we have said we wanted, and they accept that challenge.

How do we say to the nation and the world what this event is all about? How do we reach the national and international community to comment, not only on the winning entry, but also on all of the submittals? Each entry will represent a person's idea. It is a litmus test of our imaginations as a nation and a world. It is a way of honoring.

They attended the Ambassadors dinner last night. While it looks different in the communities in which they live; they saw a sense of America in the room. The stories they heard last night were rich. Can we at each of the moments that we come back to the site, 10 years after ribbon-cutting, 20 years, can we still have that feeling of dignity and respect? That is the litmus test. That is their opportunity and challenge.

4. General direction they are going

They have been working with the Oversight Committee to integrate many steps. Don then displayed and explained a chart (**see attachment 3**) that shows the steps of the design competition approach that they are moving towards.

They are looking at a two-stage design competition:

- The first stage is completely open to as many individuals and groups as wish to put forth ideas. How many we will receive is unknown. In Oklahoma City they received 624. The World Trade Center was nearer to 5,000.
- Registration will tell us how many to expect.
- After first phase submissions, we will have a stage 1 jury. Around 3 – 5 finalists will be selected to go on to a second stage of design evolution.
- Should one of the finalists be a non-professional or an individual, we will work with them to develop a team for them, to allow them to participate at a professional level.
- A second jury will evaluate the 3 – 5 finalists.
- The final recommendation will go to partners for ratification, and ultimately up to Secretary of the Interior and Congress.
- Within that overall structure are important parts:
 - Rules and regulations of design competition must be crafted around what you want at the end. Definition of what you want at the end is important.
 - The mission statement is critical as a foundation.
 - The site parameters – what makes up the site both above, on and below the ground? The history. What we say about the site. What we say about facilities.
- It is important that once we start, we move through this at a steady pace. Keep press and participants informed. Keep excitement going with no lags. Honor, honor, and honor the energy that the designers have put into this.
- There are two areas of exhibition, revolving around Stage 1 and Stage 2.
- At the end we want to have something that is inclusive and unanimous.

Public information:

- One of the rules of a design competition is that the playing field is level for everyone. The regulations, even in draft form say, none of us, none of our family, none of the consulting team may enter the competition.
- None of us may speak with any competitor. Don and Helene know that as a community we want to be helpful; we always want to help and give out information when asked. Each partner group must work with Don and Helene and understand

the process. Even though this is already a disciplined group, this is one more opportunity for us to be as disciplined as they know we are.

- Public information is important because this is the quiet one of the historic and horrific events of 9/11. This publicity brings it out into a whole new forefront.
- We will be working to combine our resources to take advantage of what we all know. We will also create a protocol for how to deal with the media so they have accurate and timely information, as well as the partners.

Jury Selection:

- It will be inclusive, but it will not be easy. It can be thrilling and satisfying however. If the process is done well, and everyone honors the process no matter what the role might be, we can do it.
- The juries will include lay people, representatives from the partner groups, as well as professionals in the related disciplines.
- Once a juror gets to the evaluation process, they are asked to set aside whom they are representing. So that a family member or lay person has as much of a valid opinion as a professional. This is very hard. Whether you are the top architect in the world, or a member of the community, you come equal.
- Lay people will be trained in how to “read” architectural models and design drawings.

In summary:

- Don and Helene design a process, they design the juries, and they design an environment for designers to do their very best work.
- What is the meaning of particular memorials to any one group of people? What they have come to realize is that there are immediate needs for a memorial. One of the things they have not thought about is the role of the memorial in the future. All of us need to think 25 – 50 years from now – not only what our immediate needs are. How do we create a memorial that speaks not only to this generation but also to future generations and lessons that can be learned?
- If we are successful, the generation 100 years from now will say, “I learned from being there.”

Discussion:

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: Are you intending a phased process? A memorial, a museum, a visitor center?

Answer from Don Stastny: That is what they are working on right now. What facilities and pieces will be a part of this, and where they might be located on the site? We all need to need to put forth a design challenge in which many people will participate, but also in which the jury can make an informed and fair analysis.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: Part of the essence of this memorial is the story that needs to be told. Yes the piece of property is serene and beautiful. But we need to have more than the property. There is a story to be told. Should this be phased?

Response from Helene Fried: The thinking has to come together in the beginning. The competitors have to have the understanding that we need to have a sense of the total experience. The experience begins the moment you turn into the site. The integrated experience of the journey itself, reaching the special spot, and then the experience of the interpretive center to understand the chapters of a story, all contribute.

Question from Commissioner Nacke: Larry, are you thinking about a memorial being one phase, and then the rest of the park will be another phase?

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: I am thinking that the visit to this memorial and the fulfillment of what we are trying to do for the families and public, is a story beyond just the landscape and driving over the hill. It seems that an information facility has to be done very closely with a memorial feature.

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: This discussion has been going on for a long time and this discussion may not be where we can resolve this. We are trying to resolve this in our Oversight Committee.

Comment from Helene Fried: We still need some recommendations very soon though. This design competition needs to be informed by that decision.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: As a family and Commission member, the longer we stray from 9/11/01, the less momentum and feelings occur. It is important to focus on how this will take form at this stage.

Comment from Commissioner Watson: If Don and Helene see something at the site that is important for us to consider in the boundary, please let us know.

Comment from Don Stastny: The last time we came in from Route 30 and progressed through the site, it gave them a completely different perspective. The grove adjacent to the crash site must be protected as much as possible. There is a phenomenal opportunity to do things throughout the site through places of remembrance, contemplative areas, interpretive areas, and so forth. When they go into a site, they try to look at it through the eyes of a designer.

Noon Recess for Lunch

D. NPS Update

Presentation by Dave Aitken, Chief of Design and Construction, Denver Service Center; Jodie Petersen, Project Manager Denver Service Center; and Joanne Hanley

Superintendent Hanley gave an overview of the Development Advisory Board (DAB), which is an advisory and oversight group formed in the mid to late 1990's in response to Congressional concerns about construction costs in the NPS. The DAB meets quarterly, rotating between Denver and Washington, DC.

The DAB reviews major park construction projects to ensure they are of high quality, incorporate sustainable practices, are sensitive to their settings, and demonstrate defensible cost conscious decisions. The members of the DAB include the National Leadership Council of the NPS, as well as five non-NPS Advisors to the Director.

The first visit to the DAB is the last week in July before the Commission meeting. Even though there are no designs or concepts to currently present, the DAB should feel they are part of our partnership. They will be briefed on the different stages of the project, including status of the fundraising feasibility study, as well as a review of the draft competition manual. When the time comes for them to review the designs and construction drawings, the hope is that they already will already feel an ownership of this themselves.

Dave Aitken and Jodie Petersen are here today to talk about how the DAB works, and the steps through which we will have to go. The mission of the DAB is to ensure that all major construction projects completed by the NPS contribute to effective resource protection, safe and high quality visitor experiences, and improved park operations in a cost effective and responsive manner.

Dave Aitken:

The DAB came about as part of the report from the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). NAPA took a look at design and construction aspects of the NPS primarily as a result of the critical press the NPS received for the high cost of comfort station construction at Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. One of the recommendations NAPA gave to the NPS to improve its design and construction efforts was to establish the DAB.

Requirements of the DAB include life cycle cost analysis of the project, a value analysis of the project, and provision of comparable costs for non-federal projects in the area. Budget, schedule and compliance are all part of the process. The DAB then determines if it is prudent to move forward with the project, or if it requires changes.

Because of the many partnership projects of the NPS, particularly in the Northeast Region, the DAB is changing the way it is doing business. A partnership project will generally have to go to the DAB at least twice. The first time laying out specific aspects of the partnership itself; agreements, fundraising efforts, etc. The second time will discuss specific aspects of design and construction.

The DAB takes a look at projects at the schematic design phase. That is early enough to be through value analysis, but not so late that change cannot be made to the project.

There are a few other processes to which we need to adhere in addition to the DAB. The Department of Interior has its own process, called "capital investment planning review board." This involves high level DOI officials including the NPS to review and approve projects. Office of Management and Budget has its own process, and the NPS works with OMB on any project over \$2 million, for which we must prepare a "capital asset plan." That report must go through the Department to OMB and in essence, must be approved by them as well.

Superintendent Hanley:

The Commission was referred to their briefing packets, in which there is a draft schedule of steps and major milestones with accompanying due dates, for various components of this project:

Major milestones were illustrated for the following:

- The design competition process
- The General Management Plan
- Fundraising Plan and Feasibility Study
- Capital Campaign
- Commission Meetings
- NPS, DOI and Congressional Briefings
- DAB briefings.

It became very clear that an integrated schedule was needed for all of these components, to make sure activities and products were being synchronized, and that reports and due dates were commensurate with briefings for the appropriate agency, Congressional and DAB meetings.

There is another version hanging on the wall which tracks very clearly, what is due on what date, by week, from April 2004 until October 2005. The Commission is encouraged

to look at it closely. It has the same information as the 2-page schedule in their briefing package, just illustrated in a different way. The Commission was asked to look for any discrepancies or obvious mistakes and let either Joanne or Jeff know.

Question from Don Stastny: When will the value analysis occur? After the competition?

Answer from Dave Aitken: During schematic design, but you can do a value analysis charette at any time, for example, in picking a location.

Announcement from Vice Chair Glessner prior to next briefing report:

Vice Chair Glessner: It is important to protect the mission statement from being used in an unofficial commercial way. Oklahoma City licensed their preamble. The press was very engaged this morning and the preamble may be in several headlines in newspapers tomorrow morning. Joanne Hanley called the National Park Foundation at lunch to ask their assistance in licensing the preamble, and even if the wording changes a bit in the editing, it will be protected.

E. Fundraising Committee

Presented by Rick Stafford, Chair of both the Fundraising Committee of the Task Force, as well as the Funding Oversight Committee.

The Funding Oversight Committee consists of representatives of each of the partner organizations and has oversight of the fundraising consultants. Mr. Stafford briefly re-described the process by which Ketchum, the fundraising consultants, were hired. They had good scores, good references, are national and international in scope, had a reasonable price, and had strong evidence of teamwork.

Mr. Bob Carter, President of Ketchum, was introduced and spoke. The firm has been in existence since 1885. He gave examples of the types of organizations with which they worked, such as the American Red Cross, World Vision, American Dental Association, Air Force Memorial, USS Missouri, National Aquarium, Yellowstone National Park, and Mesa Verde National Park.

Mr. Carter introduced Elliott Oshry, Don Zeilstra and Jason Zajac who were also present. He then gave a power point presentation depicting the following:

- Organization Chart for the Project (8 staff to the team with 150 years combined fundraising experience; 6 out of 8 are officers of the firm)
- Description of Ketchum as a company – A “values based” company. Volunteer-based fundraising; partnership building; commitment to client satisfaction and exceeding expectations.
- Map of Ketchum locations around the country – access to over 100 consultants.
- Predictive Indicators: clear and compelling case for support; sufficient contributable dollars; leadership; adequate organizational resources

Jason Zajac took over the presentation and continued the power point with the following slides:

- Description of the funding study: shaped by key stakeholders; defines funding architecture (a good case study and model to test); substantiates fundraising potential; qualified predictive indicators and provides the following:
 - Consensus
 - In-depth planning and analysis

- Honest objective data
- Specific strategic action steps
- Phase One – Internal fact finding
 - Collect input from representatives of key stakeholders through interviews (around 20) and group discussions with partner boards and committees
- Phase Two – Develop a Funding Model
 - Ketchum drafts a funding model for public/private partnership to reflect the ambitions of the Partners for the Flight 93 memorial
 - Partner organizations review and respond to the proposed funding model
- Phase Three – Feasibility Test of Funding Model
 - Interview 50 – 70 external consultants who are potential donors or leaders
 - Focus groups (3 with 15 – 25 each) for key community and partner input
 - Web-based Survey for broad public comment
- Phase Four – Analysis and Report Presentation
 - Ketchum reviews findings, analysis and observations
 - Ketchum develops specific, strategic recommendations for funding the Flight 93 National Memorial
 - Report is presented to the Partners for consideration, comment and approval.
- Added Value of Funding Study
 - Educate Multiple Constituencies
 - Cultivate Potential Leaders and Donors
 - Respond to Questions and Objections
 - Enhance Philanthropic Culture

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: How does the fact play out that we really don't know how much funding we need at this point?

Answer from Jason Zajac: We are currently drafting the case language we will use to test in the external fact finding. The emotional component will be important. We will plug in some broad-brush stroke numbers. We will be working with Joanne to develop some basic funding models. We have to answer those questions before we mount a campaign.

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: Do we have some sense of how much funding we can get from Congress?

Answer from Bob Carter: Right now we are hearing answers, which range from all private; to a 60/40 split both ways. We are working on models to see what is palatable from the Administration's point of view. Our preliminary interviews alert public officials to tell them we need their input.

Question from Commissioner Watson: Can Oklahoma City be used as an example?

Answer from Bob Carter: That was a unique case. The Memorial was 100% private.

Comment from Commissioner Linenthal: The Holocaust Museum is an example of a \$50 to \$60 million fundraising campaign with some federal funding for operations, which was in itself slightly controversial. Will this campaign try and anticipate operating funds over a period of time as a possible public/private mix?

Answer from Bob Carter: That is not what we are intending. That is an NPS call.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: We have talked with Ketchum and others about an endowment to supplement operations, but it is anticipated the operating funds will be NPS.

Comment from Bob Carter: We definitely will be asked for assurances about operations and maintenance during fundraising interviews.

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: It seems you face the same challenges as design team as far as audiences. We want to attract big hitters, but at the same time we want the kids in school to throw their pennies in the jar.

E. Lands Update

Presented by Joanne Hanley

Superintendent Hanley introduced Boyd Sponaugle and Kimberly Szezchwyck from the NPS Realty Office and Todd McNew from the Conservation Fund, who was here earlier. She complemented them on the all of the hard and diligent work done so far. They have helped push our goal forward tremendously.

1. We have a signed donation agreement between the NPS and Somerset County, which authorizes the use of \$600,0000 in donated funds for acquisition of core properties. The County Commissioners, the County Solicitor, and the NPS Solicitor have approved this agreement. The NPS as well as the Commission thank the County for their generosity and cooperation, as well as for protecting the land for all of these years, and for working cooperatively with all of us to protect it further through land acquisition.

2. All landowners within the tentative boundary area as of 5/14/04 have given permission for the realty acquisition process to proceed. National Park Service legal descriptions have been prepared for eight of the ten tracts identified on the FLNI map, Segment 01. Title evidence has been ordered and received on seven of these ten tracts. The standards for title evidence have been determined by the Department of Justice and are required for all land and/or interests in land prior to and as part of the acquisition by the National Park Service. Relocation procedures, as established under the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act, continue for two owners of core area properties. (see **attachment 4** for chart with figures).

At the next meeting, two changes to reporting will occur:

- Progress will be reported by parcels, not by landowners
- There will be a chart for the parcels on which the NPS is working, as well as a chart for the parcels on which the Conservation Fund is working.

3. The cartographic unit of the Northeast Region Realty Division has made significant progress in the mapping of the National Memorial area. Extensive deed research has been conducted. Using legal descriptions from recorded deeds, the cartographers have plotted each tract piecing the parcels together geographically on segment maps. NPS tract numbers have been assigned to each ownership interest. Preliminary segment maps 01-03 have been prepared. Segment map 04 is not ready for dissemination at this time. This system is used throughout the National Park System.

We would like to thank the Realty Officer in Philadelphia. There is an army of surveyors, realtors, appraisers, title officers' etc, who all are working behind the scenes to make this all-possible. Let's recognize them and appreciate them.

F. Boundary Study Update

Given by Jeff Reinbold:

At the last Commission meeting, the Commission agreed to postpone the designation of the boundary to this meeting, today, so they could have a more detailed site tour and do more detailed study. Remember, the Director of the NPS said their recommendation was to have only ONE boundary put forward to the Secretary, NOT go to her two times. The Director also told the Commission to make sure all the land that is needed is identified, do it right, and come back with one final recommendation.

The Commission and the Resource Assessment Committee of the Task Force sponsored a site tour on April 20, 2004. Mr. Reinbold gave a power point on the following:

- He went over the details of what it means to be in a federally legislated boundary, what types of acquisition methods area available to us, and what the requirements of the legislation are;
- He went over planning and operations criteria for acquisition such as resource protection, viewshed, visitor use areas, access, administration, etc.
- He went over the way that the site visited was structured on April 20, 2004; the sequencing of stops and at what we were looking at each stop. There were 7 stops around the property: the entrance, along the haul road, the draglines, the temporary memorial, the FBI headquarters, and the crash site. The group also walked the entire fence line. The views from each stop were analyzed, as well as safety and visitor experience.
- The day wound up at the old fire hall in Shanksville to debrief and came up with priority next steps.
- Jeff and Joanne have also started talking to individual landowners. In addition to the landowner/neighbor meeting they had a couple of months ago, they are now going from landowner to landowner within the potential boundary to make sure they are fully engaged in the process.

Motion 04 13

Motion 04 13 supercedes Motion 04 02, which directed the Flight 93 Advisory Commission, with the Flight 93 Task Force, Families and the NPS to more closely examine the land that is identified for protection around all of the area initially approved by the Commission at it's November 14, 2003 meeting, and to make the determination by May 14, 2004 if what is being proposed is sufficient, or if additional protection is needed. The Commission, with it's partners, will also examine the remaining boundary areas to resolve any potential and/or obvious omissions.

This motion changes the date from the May 14, 2004 meeting to the July 30, 2004 meeting.

Moved by Commissioner Jerry Spangler

Second by Commissioner Catuzzi

Discussion from Commission:

Question from Commissioner Wilson: Can you give an honest opinion about hitting that date?

Answer from Mr. Reinbold: We will definitely have the computer information by that date. Most of the conversations with the landowners will take place over the next couple of weeks. All the pieces of information should be together.

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: Is it possible to get updates along the way between now and the next meeting?

Answer from Mr. Reinbold: Yes.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: Wanted to give a re-emphasis from the Commission to move forward because of the critical nature of that land. The lack of initial recognition for protection south of the crash site is an oversight of the Task Force that must be corrected now. We are asking you to do a difficult chore, but it has to be.

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: Between now and the next meeting, we will probably also call another field trip and/or conference call before we finalize the recommendations.

Comment from Commissioner Felt: There are some other properties that we discussed that were candidates for scenic easements.

Question from Commissioner Linenthal: We heard from the design and fundraising folks. There are fairly significant land issues, in terms of aesthetics from afar and from near. They may not be settled by July 30 meeting. Do we act on faith and say we have to have them; put them forward to the design folks; and tell them to design folks to design on what MIGHT be there. Then what happens if it does not get included? These are some real issues that can derail the trains.

Answer from Mr. Reinbold: There are definitely a lot of trains on the tracks. One thing we have going for us is our initial recommendation from the November Commission meeting. That identifies the core lands on which we are likely to take visitors, build facilities, and have access. In the conversations we are having with the additional lands, we are talking about areas that need resource protection or scenic protection; not areas where we are putting visitors. That, we already know.

Comment from Commissioner Felt: We should not lose sight of the fact that just because someone is in the boundary, it must be understood that we may not acquire his or her land.

Question from Mrs. Catuzzi: In assuming we get the boundary line we want around the crash site, do we know those landowners?

Answer from Mr. Reinbold: Yes, they have been identified. And we are speaking with them to make sure they are part of the process. The ones we have talked to be very accommodating.

Discussion from the Public:

Question from Sandy Felt: Are the lands we are talking about the existing green area?

Answer: Yes. On the tour the focus was anything beyond the 1500 acres we spoke about in November.

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

G. Temporary Memorial Management Committee

Presentation by Donna Glessner

Commissioner Glessner reported on the following:

1. Site Visitation: Visitation at the temporary memorial has ranged from 500-1700 visitors per week during March and April, depending on the weather. We anticipate seeing many more motorcoach visits in May, including schoolchildren, senior citizens, and convention goers. Over the past eleven months (since Memorial Day, 2003) the Ambassadors have logged an estimated 139,000 visitors. Visitors continue leave tributes at the memorial, write thoughtful comments in the bound guest books, and express to the Ambassadors their gratitude for the actions of those on board Flight 93. Tributes are collected and transported to the Somerset Historical Center, as needed.

2. Parking lot/Memorial Improvement Project – the project to expand the parking lot, improve accessibility at the memorial, construct public restrooms, and improve drainage and safety at the site is on schedule at this time. The bids were opened yesterday May 13. Pending receipt of necessary permits, work may begin in late May.

Update from Joanne Hanley: The bids for the project were opened yesterday, and there were zero bids. Federal Highways will turn to 8A minority contractors so they can go to contract without further advertising.

Comment from John Reynolds: This is not unusual. They will find a way to do this. Don't be overly discouraged. They will find people.

3. Assignment of NPS Volunteer Coordinator – NPS Ranger Diane Garcia has been assigned part time to Flight 93 National Memorial as Volunteer Coordinator beginning April 4. Diane will be providing training and support to the Ambassadors, working some shifts at the memorial, and helping to coordinate with the contractor during the parking lot/memorial improvement project. She will be working with the Superintendent and the Committee to develop a policy regarding programs and special events at the temporary memorial, and the placement of large tributes.

4. Current Projects: (1) The Ambassadors will coordinate with the Bruderhof group to refinish the wooden benches at the memorial. (2) The Ambassadors will be holding a training session with Diane Garcia to improve interpretive skills and to discuss the possibility of become NPS volunteers through the V.I.P. (Volunteers in Parks) program.; (3) The Ambassadors hope to meet with Jane Thomas, archivist from the Oklahoma City Memorial, for training on May 13.

Question from Sandy Felt: Can we compare numbers from first quarter to this quarter so we can see visitation from different time periods.

Answer from Commissioner Glessner: Will give a copy of the statistics to Sandy so she can see the actual numbers.

IV. Old Business

Superintendent Hanley had a few items on which to report:

- The Student Conservation Association position description was sent to the families and the partners for the one-year internship. Two might be hired. Please send possibilities her way.
- Oral History and Documentation Project Coordinator Project Coordinator position is open. Resumes are due to Charlie Fox at the Historical Center by May 31st.
- Committee Chairs need to spend their FY 04 funding.
- A new edition of the project newsletter is on its way to the printers.

V. New Business

Videotape from Commissioner Wilson

Commissioner Wilson brought videotape for the commission to watch. One of his company's subsidiaries is the contractor building the WWII Memorial. They videotaped the construction process of the memorial. Commissioner Wilson brought this 8 ½ minute video for the group to watch.

After the video, Commissioner Wilson gave a passionate plea to meet our schedule. The secret to having this memorial open on time was "commitment to the deadlines." The same is true for us. Each thing is contingent and hinges on the next. We need to start that philosophy now. We need to hit our deadlines with the Commission, Task Force, and Committees. In order to hit our goal, we must hit our deadlines.

Acknowledgement of the Newsletter by Vice-Chair Glessner

Commissioner Glessner acknowledged the work of family member Catherine Miller from California and Jeff Reinbold in the tremendous job they did in preparing the newsletter.

All the articles were written by Task Force and Commission members, and thanks to them as well.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi

Requested that Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton be invited to one of the Commission meetings. The Commission could even write a letter to let her know how important she is to our process.

VI. Public Comments

Mr. Michael Whitely, Deputy Sheriff from a county in Ohio, gave a brief presentation to the Commission. He came representing an international police association from England, Scotland, Wales Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. These countries came together to form a group to melt down terrorist weapons for the purpose of symbolizing that people need to come together for peace. This organization wanted to open up the possibility of local dedication of a fountain that was originally placed in Ireland, and made up of thousands of criminal weapons that were confiscated and melted down. If a replica fountain were to be built from terrorist weapons, would we look into possible sites this fountain could go?

The Deputy Sheriff was looking for advice, given the fact that we already had a process, as to where this fountain might go near the property, at the edge of the property, or elsewhere that might be appropriate. He left brochures for everyone.

Commissioner Glessner thanked him and asked that anyone who wishes to speak to him do so at the end of the meeting for more information.

VII. Wrap Up and Comments

The Next meeting of the Commission is July 30, 2004. The task force will then be on July 31, 2004. Tomorrow's task force meeting begins at 8:30 AM in Shanksville.

Commissioner Glessner then asked Commissioner Reynolds if she could share his e-mail comments with everyone concerning our task because of their touching poignancy and meaning:

"The enduring and the nationally important meaning of our National Park SYSTEM...it is the ability to use the whole, to stitch what this nation is, together that really counts. Each place counts in its own right, but all the places together count in the big picture, the picture of the national heritage of each and every one of us.

It is up to us to make Flight 93 worthy for all time to be a part of that heritage; to be a place where people will say, 'Let's go there, let's learn, let's remember, let's commit to our nation and its future...and then let's go to the other places so designated to learn the full breadth of the wonder of this, our nation.' That is our job, we as Commissioners, and with all others who are caring enough to give their time, emotion, intellect and commitment...our partners in this endeavor.

We are lucky people to have this opportunity."

Meeting adjourned 45 minutes early at 3:15 PM. Prior to everyone departing, Jeff Reinbold showed a five-minute video on planning in the National Park Service.

Mr. Andrew Masich, President and CEO, Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania

During the video, Mr. Andrew Masich, President and CEO of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania and the Heinz History Center, arrived for their presentation, which was scheduled to be at 3:30. Since we were obligated to hold the meeting open until 4:00 PM, Vice Chair Glessner re-opened the meeting so that Mr. Masich could make his presentation.

The Senator John Heinz Pittsburgh Regional History Center will host the Smithsonian Institution's traveling exhibition *September 11: Bearing Witness to History* from September 11, 2004 through January 2, 2005.

Over a million people visited the exhibition while it was on view at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History in Washington, D.C.

The basic thrust of the exhibit is to invite visitors to respond to two questions: "How did you witness history of September 11, 2001?" and "Has your life changed because of that day?" Visitors will have the opportunity to write their experiences in notebook that will be collected and preserved at the Smithsonian and made available for future research.

The History Center seeks to cooperate in every way with the families and with local county and federal agencies involved in the tragic events September 11.

The History Center would like to explore ways it can cooperate and partner with the Somerset Historical Center, county commissioners, the Flight 93 Task Force, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission, and the Families of Flight 93 in educational programming such as seminars and lectures.

The History Center seeks ways how to most appropriately inform the public about the NPS memorial at Shanksville.

Question from Commissioner Wilson: Can you please describe the exhibit?

Answer from History Center Curator: It was the exhibit that was in the Smithsonian that was developed to commemorate the first anniversary. It contains memorabilia from all three sites. The exhibit was authorized by Congress to travel around the US to seven different venues.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: Is the video that we are producing of a nature that might add to or supplement this exhibit?

Answer from Commissioner Glessner: I don't know if the video would appeal to the general public. It is more for the design competition. Maybe we can promote the design competition.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: Indicated she spoke with Chairman Reynolds and Vice Chair Glessner, who suggested that if the center wanted us to participate, perhaps some sort of forum or panel in which all the partners were represented, would be appropriate. The other suggestion was that a part of the exhibit could be the memorial process.

Question from Andrew Masich: With whom shall we coordinate.

Answer from Larry Catuzzi: Susie Hankinson, as a coordinator of the Task Force should help, and put together a group for you.

Comment from Andrew Masich: The idea about a display on the memorial process is an excellent one, and one which we would like to pursue. We are looking forward

Comment from Joanne Hanley: We appreciate the sensitivity you are displaying. Please try and work with us in getting a review process together so the families can take a look at what you are doing.

Meeting re-adjourned at 3:50 PM.