

**Minutes of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission**

October 22, 2004

10:00 A.M. – 4:00 P.M.

**Minutes prepared by:  
JAMISON PROFESSIONAL SERVICES  
Forest Park, Georgia**

Chairman John Reynolds called the meeting to order at 10:15 A.M.

**Commissioners Present:**

Mr. John Reynolds, Chair  
Ms. Donna Glessner, Vice Chair  
Mr. Larry Catuzzi  
Mr. John Felt  
Dr. Brent Glass  
Mr. Jerry Guadagno  
Dr. Ed Linenthal  
Mr. Ken Nacke  
Mr. Gary Singel  
Mr. Jerry Spangler  
Mr. Dan Sullivan  
Ms. Pamela Tokar-Ickes  
Mr. Greg Walker  
Mr. Calvin Wilson

**Absent:**

Mr. Michael Watson

**I. Opening of Meeting and Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Reynolds welcomed the Commissioners and the members of the public, and formally opened the fourth meeting of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission. Superintendent Hanley then led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**II. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks**

Chairman John Reynolds welcomed everyone to the meeting, and allowed for individual introductions by each Commission member present. He thanked them all for their continued hard work, and for taking time to participate in this important endeavor. Chairman Reynolds also welcomed family members, additional National Park Service (NPS) staff and the public.

Chairman Reynolds recognized Ms. Julia Bowser, a representative from U.S. Senator **Rick Santorum's** office. The Commission was extremely pleased that she could attend.

Chairman Reynolds acknowledged all family members present. He then thanked them for their attendance, and for spending a generous part of their lives to help make all of this happen. While reflecting on their needs and the needs of future generations, it is important that everyone understand what happened here, why it happened here, and why it is so important to remember.

Chairman Reynolds recognized the remaining members of the public and the Task Force.

Chairman Reynolds gave brief opening remarks. He acknowledged the success of the planning and design process, and all of the hard work that has been devoted to this effort thus far by numerous individuals, volunteers, and consultants. The meeting was then turned over to Superintendent Hanley, who discussed the rules of housekeeping and the meeting format as well.

Superintendent Hanley advised every one of the housekeeping details for the day, putting particular emphasis on the format of the meeting. "The format will follow what we have been doing for the last two Commission meetings, and there will be several opportunities for public comment and questions throughout the meeting."

Information from Superintendent Hanley included:

1. If the Commission is voting on a motion, the public will be asked for comments following the Commission discussion, but before the vote. This is done in order that we may ensure that we get all of the public's input during voting and deliberations.
2. All other questions and comments on matters other than motions should be reserved for the public comment period, which is scheduled for the end of the meeting.
3. Superintendent Hanley advised the Commission that a new method was being used to capture the meeting minutes, and introduced Larry D. Cotton, Sr., of Jamison Professional Services. Jamison Professional Services is located in Forest Park, Georgia. Mr. Cotton will be transcribing the meeting minutes in real time, and the formal minutes will be composed from this transcript. We will continue to videotape the meetings in the interim.
4. Superintendent Hanley reminded the Commissioners to speak clearly into the microphones in order that we may ensure the capture of salient information, discussions and important data, and in case there are questions about what is contained in and what should go into the minutes. The tapes will also become a part of the permanent archives, so it is important that the discussions are clearly recorded on the tapes.

Superintendent Hanley gave everyone a copy of a revised list of motions to be considered during today's deliberations. No questions or comments followed.

### **III. Review and Approval of Minutes from July 30, 2004**

#### **Motion 04-20 Regarding the Approval of Minutes from July 30, 2004**

The Commission moved to approve the minutes of July 30, 2004.

Moved: Commissioner Glass

Second: Commissioner Catuzzi

Discussion from Commissioners:

Commissioner Felt referenced the chronology on page three, dated 7-14-04. He requested that we substitute the word "verify" as it refers to the site visit being discussed.

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed

Motion passes.

### **IV. Resource Assessment Committee Update**

Superintendent Hanley will give update on the status of the boundary, and Jeff Reinbold will give an update on the Resource Assessment Committee. Chairman Reynolds advised that this data is "for information purposes only."

*Superintendent Hanley*

“As you are aware, the recommended boundary was approved by the **Commission, and was sent to the Secretary of the Interior, through Regional Director Marie Rust**, through the Director of the National Park Service. That was done through Resolution 04-01, which you approved at the last meeting. The NPS indicated to the Commission that we would prepare an extensive briefing paper for the Secretary, which we did. We met with **Secretary Norton, Chief of Staff Brian Wademan, and Deputy Assistant Secretary Paul Hoffman** on August 27, 2004.

The Secretary was brought up-to-date on many aspects of the project, including the status of the temporary memorial, the planning and design of the memorial, the general management plan, the fundraising feasibility study and, of course, the boundary. I have put before each of you a white binder that includes a copy of the briefing paper, and the presentation that was presented to the Secretary and her staff. The Secretary understood, appreciated and really was very thankful as she concurred with the thoughtful, deliberate and logical methodology that the Commission exhibited in recommending the boundary and study.

She sent the project information forward one more time for a final look by her Assistant Secretary, her Deputy Secretary for Policy and Budget, Lynn Scarlett. If you remember, Ms. Scarlett was at our September 11, 2004 press conference representing the Secretary, and she was also very pleased with the recommendation. Everyone in the department was in concurrence, and the only reason the resolution has not been signed is because many of the folks who need to surname it and sign it are in travel -- particularly this year, which is an election year. But it is in process, and there are no issues. We had planned to have it available today, but we definitely plan to have it at our next meeting.”

Discussion from Commission:

None

Discussion from Public:

None

The floor was then given to Jeff Reinbold, NPS.

*Jeff Reinbold*

The Resource Assessment Committee had three basic goals:

1. Understand the stories of Flight 93 and how they related to the landscape;
2. Use that information to help create a boundary; and
3. Be involved in the land acquisition process.

“The first two goals have been completed. The committee continues to work on the planned acquisition issues and will be a part of those future discussions.” Jeff distributed to the Commission members some information on what *less than fee* acquisition strategies meant. “Previous discussions have been held regarding some of the land to be acquired *in fee*, where the federal government would obtain all of the rights. Additional lands inside the boundary would be acquired either *in fee* or *less than fee*. John Felt had asked that we provide more in-depth information to help explain what that meant.”

Jeff provided Commission members with some guides produced in Pennsylvania on land conservation strategies and what some of the terms mean, and how they are used specifically in the state of Pennsylvania. Jeff provided additional copies for the public and will provide them at the Task Force meeting as well.

Discussion from the Commission:

None.

Discussion from Public:

None

## **VI. Lands Issues and Update**

*Superintendent Hanley*

“I have been requested by Bill Sindelar of the NPS Realty Office, and by Todd McNew of the Conservation Fund, to give a brief update on land acquisition. The boundary that was recommended and passed at the last Commission meeting contains fifty-two (52) Somerset County property tax parcels (that doesn’t mean that there are 52 owners; one owner could own anywhere from one to ten parcels), one right of way, three subsurface mineral tracts, one donated parcel outside of the park boundary, and the drag lines.

The NPS’ Northeast Region Cartographic staff is working exclusively on Flight 93 to establish the legal descriptions for the additional 31 parcels identified July 30, for inclusion in the final park boundary. A legal description of land is ‘a description of real property by meets and bounds.’ Such a description also must be complete enough that a particular parcel of land may be located and identified, and sufficient for the NPS’ lands mapping program, which means that when you go out to survey it, the survey must close at the end of your survey run.

The first phase of deed research has been completed. Additional research may be required to address any title issues, which may arise in the course of the acquisitions. Both the NPS and the Conservation Fund continue negotiations with core landowners to resolve property title issues and appraisal issues. Numerous discussions with landowner attorneys have been made since the last meeting. That is in an attempt to move forward with the land acquisition process.

Three industrial moving contractors have submitted bids for the relocation of the personal property. All three firms have expressed their desire to work on the Flight 93 Memorial because of their national pride and, as one contractor wrote in his proposal, ‘to honor what so few of our fellow Americans did for so many.’”

“A major accomplishment of the NPS Realty Office has also been to update the partial listings to include all of the additional parcels recommended from last July. I am passing this out because it was not included in your briefing package. These parcel listings include identifying the Somerset County property, map number, identifying the deed number, and the acreage from the county map. If you will recall, the NPS also had the dedicated NPS track number that matches and is compatible with the NPS land acquisition tracking process, which is consistent from park to park to park across the country. Work continues, however, by the NPS to be focused on the core properties and the 1500 acres.”

I’d like to turn everyone’s attention to a matter that we have not discussed previously, and that is the solid terrain model that is sitting outside. I think all of you probably saw it as you came in. It was donated to us through the services of BAE Systems and Digital Globe, but one thing that we hadn’t mentioned was how that happened. Nancy Russell is the Chief Cartographer for the NPS Realty Office, and she received a phone call from BAE Systems, who said they would like to do something. Nancy acted on our behalf and encouraged them and helped coordinate all of the efforts, and basically provided all of the data for managing this project. Through Nancy’s efforts, BAE Systems and Digital Globe came up with an absolutely fabulous and magnificent piece of work that we will talk about in just a little bit. So I would also like to go on record that in

addition to thanking BAE Systems and Digital Globe, which Chairman Reynolds will do, I'd like to thank Nancy Russell from the NPS Realty Office for really taking on this project."

Chairman Reynolds recognized **Clark Seldon** of BAE who was in the audience. Mr. **Seldon** briefly acknowledged Nancy's tremendous and timely efforts as well. Chairman Reynolds read a "thank you on behalf of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission" for the model which read, in part, "With the announcement of the design competition for the permanent memorial on September 11, 2004, Flight 93 is being brought into the forefront of the American public's attention again." This is provided as **Attachment A**.

(Audience applause.)

Chairman Reynolds revisited the Resource Assessment Committee report. "The Resource Assessment Committee has been keeping track of the land activities, but as the land acquisition program gets to the point where more of the information becomes privileged information (all of which we need to know about because we are Federal Commissioners, and also which information is not available to the public), we are in a situation where the Resource Assessment Committee can't be involved in lands. As a result, you're going to see motions in an effort to accomplish two things:

1. Be able to create a committee from this Commission that will be able to take over that portion of the Resource Assessment Committee's responsibility to provide leadership in the land function; and
2. Recommend to the NPS that we become more personal in our relationship with the landowners by having a person stationed here in Somerset that can be directly involved among the landowners, their representatives, and the NPS."

Chairman Reynolds asked that all Commissioners peruse the wording of the report to ensure concurrence.

#### **Motion 04-21 Regarding Lands**

The Commission will form a Lands Oversight committee, appointed by the chair, to assist the NPS in forwarding and completing the land acquisition process. In addition, the Commission strongly recommends that the NPS duty-station a realty employee in Somerset for the duration of the project, effective immediately.

(This is the final approved version incorporating all comments).

Moved: Commissioner Walker

Second: Commissioner Tokar-Ickes

Discussion from the Commission:

Vice-Chair Glessner: recommended that the report, as amended, be read for the audience.

Chairman Reynolds: read the report as amended.

Commissioner Felt: asked for more clarity in the language.

Commissioner Wilson: responded that "the idea is to have someone stationed in Somerset to have constant communication with the lawyers and landowners in order to get the process going."

Chairman Reynolds: suggested that the Commission change the language to "realty oversight" from "land oversight", and "lands person" to "realty person." The Commission agreed unanimously.

Commissioner Catuzzi: had a cosmetic change – the first paragraph, second sentence starts "service in forwarding." He would add "and completing" the land acquisition process. This would hopefully show closure to this activity."

Chairman Reynolds: agreed. Also in the second paragraph, “person” should be changed to “employee.”

Mr. Catuzzi: asked for clarity about the phrase “duty-station.” Superintendent Hanley: advised that it is, in fact, a proper technical NPS term.

Discussion from the Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

With the Commission’s approval, Chairman Reynolds suggested that he and Larry Catuzzi co-chair the realty oversight committee. Jerry Spangler had already volunteered to be a member of this committee, and Ken Nacke and Donna Glessner joined as well.

## **VI. Planning Process: GMP/EIS Update**

*Power Point Presentation by Jeff Reinbold, NPS*

“When we talk about the planning process, we usually start with the overall integrated planning process diagram. We have moved beyond that and are now engaging very specific tasks.”

Jeff revisited all of the major milestones and steps in the design competition, i.e., stages one and two. This does not include all of the pre-competition work that was done. Jeff explained the timeline for the GMP, and the need for all of this to work in concert in meeting the currently scheduled September 25, 2005 deadline. The major tasks match with the corresponding tasks in the design competition. They also match with the Commission meetings.

For today’s meeting Jeff reported on the jury, how the competition is going, and the initial pieces of the GMP. “By the time we meet in January, we will be looking at the progress on the GMP. We will continue to update as we go along, and as we complete tasks. As of now we are going strong and are on schedule, and we should easily meet the September 25, 2005 deadline.”

Jeff talked about the components of an Environmental Impact Statement, and the importance of future management of the memorial being consistent with the present ideas and philosophy of the designs being selected.

Some of the highlights included:

### **Issues:**

- *Purpose and Need* - Why are we doing this?
- *Affected Environment* - A description of what is out there now
- *Alternatives* - Our 3-5 finalists from the design competition
- *Impact Analysis* - Assessing the impact of doing any of the above
- *Coordination and Consultation* - Not only with the public, but also with local, regional and other federal government agencies as well.

### **Transportation:**

Average Daily Traffic (“ADT”) volumes, % of trucks, assessing roadway conditions, accident data, and site distances show local roads are not designed or constructed to accommodate large traffic volumes and/or heavy tour busses. The idea to use Route 30 as entrance makes sense from a safety standpoint.

**Site distance and access from US 30:** We are working with PA Department of Transportation for solutions. We are also in close coordination with local emergency responders should some roads through the Memorial be closed.

**Water Resources:**

Next to traffic, this is the most important land issue. Perpetual treatment of the acid mine drainage is required to maintain the water quality in Lambert's Run and the Stony Creek.

There was considerable discussion on the availability of potable water for visitors to the site, and the appropriateness of developing new wells or tying into the local public water supply.

**Geotechnical:**

The entire "project area" has been surface-mined and has similar constraints. Subsurface exploration using test borings will be required to delineate and define specific foundation conditions.

The type of memorial design selected, and its accompanying facilities, immediately influences future geotechnical work.

**Adjacent Land Uses:**

- Issues included a lack of land-use planning and lack of incentives; lack of regulations could lead to incompatible development and loss of area's rural character.
- Creation of the National Memorial will affect traditional uses (hunting, ATV, etc.) and access to the reclaimed strip mine sites.
- Conversations with landowners show a strong interest in protecting the rural character of the area and ensuring "local control of their own future."

Jeff advised that although the "control their own future" phrase might look like a concern over outside government interference, it is rather a concern that "if we don't think about what could happen out there, other developers or national chains could shape our future for us."

**Hazardous Materials:**

Some contaminants remain from mining and other industrial uses, but these areas will be remediated as part of the federal acquisition process.

Some naturally occurring heavy metals are found at the site, but their localized effects can be better understood and mitigated once the finalists are selected.

**Visitation and Economics:**

- Initial analysis projects an average of 230,000 visitors are likely over a 10-year period after completion of the memorial.
- Future world events, the selected design, and promotion will affect visitation levels.
- Costs may be borne by a jurisdiction (Stonycreek Township) that does not directly benefit from increased visitor spending (like Somerset Township and Somerset Borough might)
- What does it mean in terms of tax dollars and jobs created that will result from that visitation?
- We are endeavoring to understand how the local jurisdiction will benefit from the increased visitor spending. Stonycreek Township will likely have to bear the burden of those visitors coming.

**For the Next Commission Meeting:**

- Finalizing data gathering reports.
- Preparing “purpose and need” section.
- Refining Issues.
- Examining “No Action/Current Management” Alternative

Jeff advised that “we have also formed a GMP Coordinating Committee, which had its first meeting in October. The group is charged with involving local residents in the process. They will ensure that the numbers we use in the fundraising are the same number we are using in the management plan, and sharing information back and forth.”

The NPS Social Science office created a draft “Socioeconomic Atlas”, which identifies a region around the memorial, and trends in six or seven counties around Somerset, i.e., changing farmlands, what kinds of pressure are out there, etc. We also considered the rates of change that are being seen. This data is compared to about 20 indicators to get a better understanding of what is happening in the surrounding areas.

Jeff recognized two consultants who have done incredible work behind the scenes on this project, Eileen Carlton and Merlin Paulson, a professor at Colorado State University in landscape architecture.

Question from Commissioner Glass: “Has there been any measurable economic change or activity included in the study?”

Answer from Jeff Reinbold: “We are trying to understand what has happened in the years since then, and what we are likely to see. Obviously, what we are likely to see is greatly influenced by some of those factors I mentioned earlier. In the interim, we can take some of the numbers on visitors who are there, and try to understand what types of impact those people will have.”

**VII. Design Solicitation Committee Update**

*Presentation by Tim Baird and Gina Farfour*

“We are pleased with the responses we have received to date. The NPS staff has been invaluable to us during the registration period, and we really appreciate it. We had our first site tour yesterday for registrants, and we would like to thank Charles Fox and the Historical Society for making it a great first tour. The participants walked away with a great sense of the history of this area, and the impact site presents a unique challenge in the design process. We are all enthusiastic and excited about what is happening. The next tour is scheduled for November 13<sup>th</sup>, and should show an increase in the number of participants.

The stage one jury confirmation is very close, and we should have it completed by December; the stage two jury will be confirmed in January. It has been a pleasure to work with everyone involved. People seem to be very positive about the information, and we look forward to a fantastic result.”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “How many registrants are there to date?”

Answer from Tim Baird: There are over a thousand, from almost every state and 15 countries. The registration fee of \$25 is incredibly modest, but this amount is in keeping with what the families of Flight 93 wanted, i.e., anyone with an idea should be able to participate. Will the

number continue to hold? Last week, 83 people registered. It seems that we have very ample representation.”

*Presentation by Don Stastny, Design Competition Consultant:*

“The packet that we have been discussing is the one the competitors get when they register. This work contains an overall folder, the regulation book, and the history and context of the place, as well as the schedule. It also includes a CD video tour of the site itself. It implies that we are expecting a certain amount of design excellence and ideas.”

Don gave a comprehensive power point presentation of the schedule and timeline of the competition.

Don explained that there are two stages of exhibition revolving around stage 1 and stage 2. When stage 1 ideas come in, they come in a specified format. These will be mounted for exhibition and will be available first for the families to view, next for the partners, then for public viewing prior to the stage one jury evaluating the various schemes. The stage one jury has an extremely important role to play as we move on to the next stage.

There will be a workshop for the finalists in stage two to work with the NPS and to help support the NPS and the GMP. This creates an opportunity for collaboration among the finalists, ultimately making the final memorial design that much better. After that, we will receive the stage two submission, and go through the same kinds of exhibits as we did in stage one. We want to ensure that the first concept seamlessly evolves into the second concept. The exhibits will be staged in the Somerset area, possibly will be sent to the West Coast, and will be published on our web site for additional viewing.

Some of the material distributed during Don’s presentation included a base map of the area with contours, and an illustration of a number of different elements being utilized to create a first level playing field. “We composed a flight organization diagram, which addresses not where the memorial will be, but how the visitor experience might occur. It begins up on Highway 30, and as you know, the boundary includes the area to the north of Highway 30 as well. So, we are able to control the whole environment as you come in. The sacred ground area is defined by the fences. This particular area will be specifically designed for the families. Any design efforts to be utilized in the sacred ground area should be minimized and be done in such a way that it only facilitates the use of the area by the families. That area will be dedicated for the use of the families and NPS personnel. It will not be open to the public.

The document also deals with issues related to the area immediately around the sacred ground, i.e., how will you develop a secure perimeter as far as where the current fence is? If someone designs a memorial expression in that area, they would have to take into account the fence and the security system put in that area.

“The site visits are put together in such a way that we try to give the same kind of impression that we have in the book. We begin by using the Historical and Genealogical Society of Somerset County as a resource, showing a video presentation about the area of the country. We then let them go through the exhibit. They then receive a briefing much like this as far as what is in the book, and what the rules and regulations are.

We take them to the site on the same journey I explained to you. Our journey begins at Highway 30 to overlook the entire site, coming down the Haul Road to the approach area, coming up to the drag lines, where they can see the impact site, going down to the temporary memorial, around to

the welding shops where the FBI and examination headquarters were set up. We finally take them down to the fence and grassy knoll to allow them to get close to the impact site itself. It is not just a memorial visit, but a whole sequence of activities.

We are very carefully constructing the juries, and have completed our interviews with the family members. We will bring those recommendations to you in December.”

On behalf of the Commissioners, Commissioner Catuzzi commended Don and Helene for the work done so far; additionally commending him for the quality of work put into the presentation. “I hope that the quality of work of our registrants is equally as good as the information you have put out to the public.”

Chairman Reynolds added thanks as well.

Commissioner Glass asked for clarity on the issue of when registrants come up with ideas. “Do you combine suggestions at this point and introduce competitors to each other, or is there an advantage for them working together in this process?”

Don advised that there is nothing that speaks to that specifically. “We will give a charge to the stage one jury, and we almost have to see what comes in order to really understand. What we find is that the first concepts are so strong that it isn’t a matter of supermarket shopping, i.e., one of these, two of those, one of them, but the concept itself -- in order to be elevated to the second level -- will be so strong that it will carry itself. I might say that we had the opportunity to speak with each of the family members over a day and a half, and it was extraordinarily enlightening. We asked if they had concerns or ideas, and they said that one of the main things is creativity. This first jury really has to have a strong sense of creativity. It will be interesting to see how this plays out.”

Jeff Reinbold advised that “a lot of the people on the Design and Solicitation Committee and Design Oversight were very initially concerned about how this idea would be received. It was wonderful to be a part of the site tour and see the mixture of people that came. It was really enlightening to know that the time everyone has put into their presentations, and the philosophy behind them, works. If that group is an indication of the other competitors, they are really excited to come up with something fitting this project.”

Commissioner Wilson asked for clarity on the fail-safe system, and the responsibilities of the design oversight committee that is involved with this project.

Don intimated that “the design oversight committee has been diligently working with us on the process. The design oversight committee has given a tremendous amount of overview, and ‘really good nit picking.’ A strong theoretical base was put together. As we now move into the design competition process, the design oversight committee is elevated to take on the adjudication type of responsibility. If we need specific direction, we will go to the design oversight committee, who has responsibility for a solution. This will occur if there are any communication breakdowns or anything involving the communication process. It will also be important that when the material comes in, that if the criteria is not met, we will make recommendations to the committee, who will decide the status, i.e., if the format is wrong or if there were different kinds of things wrong.”

Questions from the public: None.

Chairman Reynolds offered his appreciation for the work being done, and advised that the only appointed body that can say, “yes, these are the juries”, or “no these are not the juries”, is the Advisory Commission. The procedures call for the Advisory Commission to approve the juries. As Don said, the phase one jury is not entirely put together yet because the consultants are balancing the composition of the juries. We can’t vote on a partial jury. We need a motion to allow the Commission to come back into session by telephone later on in the month. So the motion that we are going to take now is a motion to allow that to happen. I’ll read the motion, and make one change in the wording.”

#### **04-22 Motion Regarding the Design Solicitation Committee**

The Advisory Commission will have a telephone meeting on December 3, 2004, from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM EST, for the purpose of hearing, discussing and voting on the proposed design competition phase one jury as recommended by the Design Oversight Committee. This meeting will follow all Federal Advisory Commission requirements, and will be advertised in the Federal Register for the requisite period of time. The NPS office in Somerset will be open to the public to participate on the conference calls.

Moved: Ken Nacke

Second: Larry Catuzzi

Discussion from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Glass: wanted to ensure that the Commission will receive the materials ahead of time. Chairman Reynolds concurred.

Commissioner Catuzzi: wanted to ensure that the commitment is there for each person that they will accept if they are chosen for the jury, and Don advised that the agreement is in place.

Discussion from the Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

#### **NOON RECESS FOR LUNCH**

Chairman Reynolds called the meeting to order, and recognized Rick Stafford, as well as Jason Zajac and Don Zielstra from Ketchum.

#### **VIII. Fundraising Committee Update**

*Rick Stafford, with Jason Zajac and Don Zielstra from Ketchum.*

Rick Stafford commented that significant progress has been made on government funding since last the last meeting. Governor Rendell’s commitment is positive and great news to the Commission.

#### **Completion of Fundraising Feasibility Study:**

Rick Stafford went on to state that it appears that private support for capital development in the range of \$25 to \$30 million in private money appears feasible. This is contingent on properly organizing a campaign. This money is not going to come without a lot of effort and some spending and organizing to get those funds. Ketchum will explain the methodology used.

Jason Zajac gave a special thank you to the Fundraising Oversight Committee, “which has been particularly responsive in providing support and time,” and provided the following summary of the feasibility study.

**Findings and Observations:**

Overall – Good or bad study? “We believe that this is a very positive study. We have validated the capacity of the partners to conduct a successful private sector campaign in support of this effort.

We realized near unanimous consensus on the suitability of the creation of a national memorial, and that consensus is widely endorsed. There are strong feelings that the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, particularly the Flight 93 event, are a compelling example of patriotism and citizenship that deserve to be interpreted in the context that a national memorial will provide. There is also broad consensus that it is completely appropriate that this be done via a public-private partnership.”

Don Zielstra presented the Study Summary

***Phase One***

- Briefings
- 24 Interviews with Partner Representatives and Stakeholders
- Benchmark research
- Report Presentations

***Phase Two***

- 39 Interviews (continuing)
- 16 Focus Group Participants
- 350 Web Survey Responses
- Continuous Oversight Committee Briefings

**Findings and Analysis**

*Should there be a National Memorial and National Park?*

There is strong agreement regarding appropriateness of a national memorial in remembrance of the dramatic story of the passengers and crew members of Flight 93

*Themes for Supporting the Memorial*

The resonance of themes varies by constituency; “honor the heroes” is most universal, consistent attraction to patriotism as overall theme.

*Opinion of the Plan to Meet the Need*

It is Important to place the events of 9/11/01 in the context of global challenges. There were some questions regarding local investment needed for National Park.

*Appraisal of the Project (Priority Rating)*

Further cultivation of donors will likely elevate priority of project in their giving scheme. It is not on anyone’s radar now.

*Appropriateness of a Public/Private Partnership*

There is strong consensus (70%) regarding the need for a public/private partnership; there is precedence of partnership for other National Park and national memorial projects.

*Appropriateness of a 50/50 split Between the Partners*  
There is interest in an approximately equal partnership.

*Government Funds for the Memorial*  
There is strong interest in both federal and state participation; the anticipation is that the federal support will be larger than state.

*Geographic Split if Private Funds*  
The significance of the event is seen as national in scope.

*Receptivity to a Capital Campaign*  
The capital campaign is anticipated to be well received in both major gifts and outreach segments

*Attainability of the Goal*  
The tested fundraising goal of \$60 million is perceived as too large. A range of \$25 to \$30 million in private funds is do-able and appropriate.

*Availability of Standards of Giving Necessary for Success*  
There were questions regarding access to the very largest gifts.  
There is an absolute necessity for campaign leadership to open doors; many felt if we had the right leadership, the gifts will be easier.

*Willingness to Give: Personal and Corporate Gifts*  
Suggested leaders, suggested top donors, and family members most positive regarding willingness to consider a gift.  
Some willingness to give is contingent on final memorial plan and eventual high level leadership.

*Naming Opportunities*  
There was universal understanding for the need for “sensitively handled” donor recognition.

*Willingness to Volunteer/Accept a Leadership Role*  
The project priority is a challenge to volunteers and leadership; further development of plan and strong leader(s) will overcome this challenge.

*Economic Outlook for the Campaign*  
The economic environment not likely to influence success of campaign.

*Proposed Timing of Campaign*  
The proximity to the events of 9/11/01 is seen as issue of urgency.

*Recommendation to Proceed*  
Overall, yes, with an appropriate plan and national leadership.

**Observations: Strengths**

- Clear understanding of the case for support
- Compelling interpretive themes
- Near universal support for public/private partnership funding model
- Support of family members
- Valid leadership model and outreach potential.

**Observations: Challenges**

- Access to individuals of significant affluence and influence
- Moderate philanthropic priority assigned by potential donors and leaders
- Geographic ownership of project
- Questions regarding appropriate scale of the project
- Questions regarding federal funding role.

Don Zielstra went on, “We are not on the radar for a lot of people today. There is a strong feeling that ownership should be national in scale. What exactly is the federal role going to be? We need some assurances that the funding model is endorsed by the NPS and those who are ultimately responsible for the development of the site.”

**Recommendations from Ketchum:**

- Adopt recommended and validated leadership model. We are recommending a continuing role for a funding oversight committee whether it is this particular oversight committee or not, we do think there is a role for that. We think there is an absolute need for a national, high profile “working chair” of the campaign, i.e., a Fortune 500 CEO; someone who has easy access to centers of influence, especially for funding resources. There is also a role for a celebrity for national outreach.
- We would like to see a national retail partner for a presence in front of Americans all over the country.
- We also believe that we will need a national media partner.
- Select and enlist leadership – no factor will influence our success as much as this element.
- Document appropriate scale of project.
- Define the role of the partner organizations relative to the campaign. Number of issues should be handled by partner organizations.
- Organize a strong major gifts campaign, which is a critical component of the project. Approximately 60% of total income.
- Rather than take a second tier national leader, we suggest looking for an ideal national chair by starting with the regional leadership in Pennsylvania due to a greater awareness.
- Expand the outreach segment of campaign.
- Establish infrastructure for the campaign.
- Adopt a two-year campaign timetable. This is not a campaign that would attract volunteer support over a longer term than that.
- Allocate budget resources to support campaign activity. We have submitted to the funding oversight committee a fairly detailed budget estimate of what it would cost to conduct a campaign of this magnitude.
- Requires a significant amount of travel around the country.

“Through very preliminary conversations with the National Park Foundation, we believe that they are in a particularly strong position to serve as a partner for the infrastructure of the campaign -- independent, but under the oversight of the partners. This is the most cost-effective model.

### **Immediate Next Steps**

- Develop a plan to finance the private sector capital fundraising campaign.
- Where do we get the money to finance the cost? We have done enough due diligence to understand that the cost can be significant. What do we need to get to the critical benchmark where contributions are beginning to come?
- No one wants to proceed without a clear understanding of where the dollars are.
- Negotiate contract for fundraising counsel.
- Select and recruit leadership and organize for the capital fundraising campaign.

Question from Commissioner Glass: “What is your estimate of the cost to finance the private sector capital campaign, i.e., the start up costs?”

Answer from Ketchum: “We don’t have those numbers yet, but that is something we are working on. If we can get a national leader, we might only need two or three months going in to know that the dollars are there.”

Jason Zajac explained that we could be four to five months into this project before we see major donor commitments coming in, and have a positive cash flow. Even though someone signs a pledge for a million dollars, that does not mean that the money is readily and immediately available.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “I have a couple of questions relative to your draft contract. Is there any way that you can see yourself funding the early portions of this campaign so that the burden is not on the Families of Flight 93? Especially given the fact that we have very little money, and we have not raised any money yet. Think about it anyway, of becoming a partner and funding some of that money on your own. It also looks like the families are paying a lot of incidental expenses as well. I don’t understand why they are not included in the \$2.5 million in expenses?”

Answer from Jason Zajac: “I’m not clear on the incidentals to which Mr. Catuzzi is referring, but I don’t think there is anything outside to be incurred.”

Chairman Reynolds advised that some of these questions are still under consideration by the Oversight Committee, and he is pretty certain that there should be no extra costs that are not included in the project.

Don Zielstra agreed to follow up for Mr. Catuzzi.

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: “Has Ketchum approached anyone yet for the national chair position?”

Answer from Don Zielstra: “No one has been approached. Hopefully by Monday, we will have recommendations from Ketchum to the Oversight Committee.”

Jason Zajac added, “Ketchum is being very careful and balanced in their efforts. Ketchum is giving recommendations to the Funding Oversight Committee based on our experiences, and making sure that the partners are all comfortable before any enlistment is made. However, we want to be careful that we do not get too far ahead of ourselves, i.e., public declines of leadership.”

Chairman Reynolds thanked Ketchum for a wonderful presentation.

### **Motion 04-23 Regarding the Fundraising Committee**

The Commission accepts the fundraising feasibility report from Ketchum, and thanks them for their hard work, patience, tenacity and commitment to ensuring a high quality, comprehensive product.

Moved: Jerry Spangler.

Second: Dan Sullivan:

Discussion from Commissioners:

None

Discussion from the Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed

Motion passes.

### **IX. Archive Committee Update**

*Barbara Black*

“Our visitation levels continue to be very strong, and with that visitation comes the tributes. As I have presented to you before, the tributes continue after almost three years to be heartfelt and very widespread over the country and the world. We have collected an estimated 20,000 objects, of which about one fourth have been cataloged, and we are trying to keep ahead of that a little bit. The objects are then stored in a remote location. After three years, the tributes continue to be strong.”

Question Commissioner Felt: “What are the current attributes of the project? I was wondering what was being done. We should make our records as complete as possible.”

Answer from Ms. Black: “That is part of the oral history project. All of the meeting minutes, reports and attachments will be saved from all of the meetings.”

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: “I think that is a good observation. It is important that you keep your records and documents, as they will become a part of the administrative history of the park, and we do deal with administrative histories in the NPS. It is an ongoing process. So, keep everything that you have. It is really important. One of our goals is to expand upon that process. Betty Kemmerer has already agreed to head the project, but we have not had the time to start accumulating the notes and minutes to make an administrative history. John, would you like to help?”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “Is storage capacity adequate?”

Answer from Ms. Black: “Right now it is adequate. The collection is only housed for a few months before we send the shipments on to Iron Mountain for storage.”

Question from Commissioner Wilson: “Are items being sent to you directly, or are they being collected from the temporary memorial?”

Answer from Ms. Black: “Both. We are collecting at the site constantly, but things also get sent directly to us, the NPS office, from a number of sources. Some things never get put out at the site; they may be too fragile.”

Question from the public: “Is there one place for storage?”

Answer from Ms. Black: “The storage area is very good. We toured the facility, this remote storage facility where they are being temporarily stored until the memorial is complete. It has very high standards. They have a constant temperature between 65 and 68 degrees, at about 50% relative humidity.

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: He suggested that the Commission members visit the collection some time and think about people 100 years from now as they look at it. It really touches you in a lot of ways.

Site Administrator Charles Fox, Somerset Historical Museum, on behalf of the Oral History and Documentation Project Coordinator, Alexa Potter, gave the Oral History Report. It is provided as **Attachment B**.

## **X. Temporary Memorial Management Committee Update**

*Donna Glessner*

### **Visitation at the Flight 93 Temporary Memorial**

- The average number of visitors during August, September and October was 4,500 per week. This average does not include the week of September 11<sup>th</sup>
- The number of visitors on weekdays is from 250-500 each day.
- On Saturdays and Sundays, visitation ranged between 750-1600 people each.
- Visitation shows a sharp increase in May, peaks in August, and remains high through September and October.

### **Motorcoach and Bus Groups**

- The number of motorcoach and bus groups to the temporary memorial has increased over the past year.
- In September 2004, 55 motorcoaches or buses visited the site. Through the first three weeks of October, 62 bus groups have visited the site.
- For some groups, the memorial is a stop (planned or unplanned) on trips to Gettysburg, Lancaster, Washington, D.C., and New York City.
- For other groups, the memorial is a primary destination.
- October is the high point of the motorcoach season.

Ambassador services are available through the summer and fall, from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Ambassadors care for the site and the tributes left there, replaces and waters flowers, and collects trash.

“Our most recent project was refinishing the benches with brown paint that should discourage graffiti. In the coming weeks, we will prepare for winter by removing small tributes from the ground. In January 2005, the Ambassadors will complete their third full year of service. But, this is not the end!

In 2005, we anticipate doing the improvement project for the parking lot and the surface to make it safer for walking.”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “Is it possible for us to think about in 2005 maybe another evening that we could spend with the Ambassadors?”

Answer from Commissioner Glessner: “You don’t have to wait!” (Laughter from the Commission.)

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “Well, we have sort of run out of time for this, but I was thinking maybe you would think about it, we could change the structure and have an evening with the Ambassadors.”

Answer from Commissioner Glessner: “We could meet in Somerset. I think it is a great idea. We usually have a dinner during that time of year, so yes.”

Comments from the Public: None

## **XI. Family Memorial Update**

*Ken Nacke*

“I think it is vitally important that after the stage 1 jury has voted on three to five finalists, it comes through the Commission for approval. After all is said and done, it is important that we take those submissions and the comments of the jurors and summarize them, then take them to the West Coast for the west coast families to consider. I think it will also help with the fundraising efforts.

Comment from Don Stastny: “We have a couple of options Ken, and I think we should be able to do it one way or the other.”

Commissioner Nacke went on to say, “It might be February or March, or between stage 1 and stage 2. Take the storyboards out there for discussion with the families. Some people can’t make it out to Pennsylvania.”

Questions from the Commission: None

Comments from the Public: None

## **XII. Communication Committee Update**

*Pamela Tokar-Ickes*

“I will be brief. I wanted to update you on the activities of the Communication Committee. As you can see in your briefing reports, we have not met since the last Commission meeting, but I can assure you that there has been behind the scenes work -- as you might expect. It is clear after listening to all the reports that we have heard at today’s Commission meeting that we all have the same vision. It is imperative that we now begin to officially speak with the same voice. That is truly the goal of the Communications Committee. You will remember that back in June a unified communication strategy was the priority that was outlined. We had great cooperation from the local media, and most importantly, they have been very compassionate in their coverage. We are not the forgotten site, but we do not receive the same level of attention as the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. As we move forward, there truly is a critical need for us to issue an RFP for a communications consultant to manage this complex process. The RFP is ready. However, it has been placed on hold due to funding issues to pay the consultant.

The Governor announced a \$250,000 grant would be made available to the Advisory Commission for use in whatever needs funding. I have had preliminary discussions with Joanne Hanley and she with the governor’s office about using a portion of that money for a Communications Consultant. The grant would be made to the Advisory Commission; however we are recommending that the Commission actually transfer the funding to the Families of Flight 93 to actually handle the details of contracting the consultant, as they do with the other consultant contracts. Today, I will seek a motion that we approve the use of that \$250,000 from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a communications and public relations consultant, and/or to begin work on a portion of the fundraising campaign. I believe there is some flexibility built into the funding, and we anticipate further discussions with the Governor’s office.”

### **Motion 04-24 Regarding the Communications Committee**

The Commission approves the use of the \$250,000 grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a communications/public relation’s consultant and/or for work on a portion of the fundraising capital campaign. This will ensure maximum flexibility in use of the funds for these two priority projects

Moved: Commissioner Tokar-Ickes

Second: Commissioner Catuzzi

Discussion from Commissioners:

Comment from Commissioner Glass: "Assuming that there will be some type of budget submitted or spending plan, the amount going to communications and the amount going to fundraising will be identified in the grant application itself... you'll probably have to spell that out."

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: "Absolutely."

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: "What we are trying to do is get some federal monies changed so that we can use them for the communications consultant, and in that way use the state funding for the start up costs for the capital campaign."

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: "Of the firms that were identified, Pam and Joanne, as I remember there were a half dozen firms identified as prospects. I would urge us to go back and ask, to the extent they can, what type of pro bono work they may provide for us as a firm and maybe use that as one of the priority criteria for retaining them. I think we are getting some discounted numbers from Ketchum, and I think that it is important that we consider some pro bono work and make that a priority consideration in our award."

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: "We will be working out the details, and the communications committee will be meeting very shortly to actually work on those details and how we will approach it. So the RFP should be out very shortly."

Discussion from the Public:

None.

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

Commissioner Tokar-Ickes gave a note of thanks to the NPS from the Communications Committee.

### **XIII. Miscellaneous NPS Report**

#### State Funding

*Joanne Hanley*

"I just have a few items to go over from the NPS. I wanted to touch briefly on the state funding one more time. As was stated earlier, Governor Rendell generously committed \$10 million towards our project. We have been in contact with his staff in Harrisburg not only about the \$250,000, but about the \$10 million as well. We have offered to come and present a briefing or briefings on the project. We will continue to offer this. I need to find out exactly "what type of money this is" and how we access this money. It is not exactly clear that it is capital redevelopment funds; I am assuming it is. I would like to request that we draft a letter to the governor from the Commission thanking him for his generosity and gently reminding him of his kind offer, and then identifying myself and possibly another Commission member or two to travel to Harrisburg to discuss the funding with him or his designated staff."

Question from Chairman Reynolds: "I assume the Commission agrees with that?"

Question from Commissioner Felt: "What type of money is it?"

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: "That is what we need to find out."

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: "We have to find out."

## FY 2005 Federal Funding Status

*Joanne Hanley*

“I will now move on to the status of the federal budget for 2005. We are on a continuing resolution right now, which means that we do not have a final 2005 budget yet approved for NPS, or its projects or its programs, and Congress is now in recess until after the elections. I just want to report on what both the House and Senate reported in their markups before they left, concerning the funding which affects us.

In terms of land acquisition, the House did not have land acquisition funding identified for Flight 93. The Senate had \$2 million identified in its markup.”

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: “The House didn’t identify any project of the NPS, or the US Forest Service, or the Fish and Wildlife Service, for any particular land acquisition – it has a lump sum of money. It is not that they are singling out Flight 93, it is just that the House chooses at this point not to identify any projects.”

Superintendent Hanley continued: “Thank you. The House had \$250,000 identified for statutory aide to the Commission. That is the technical assistance, the travel money for a lot of other things that we provide. The \$250,000 for FY05 was also intended to be shared with the county of Somerset this upcoming year for security at the site. The Senate did not have statutory aide identified.

Funding for improvements to the temporary memorial were included in both the House and Senate markups. Now we will see where those figures wind up when they go back into session shortly after the election. We will keep you posted.”

## NPS Personnel Changes

*Joanne Hanley*

Superintendent Hanley introduced Ginger Mesko. “Ginger is our fulltime student intern from the Student Conservation Association. We are very lucky to have her until the end of summer 2005.”

“Joyce Boone is now back at Fort Necessity and only has a one hour commute to work, not 2 hours as she did when she was helping us out here in Somerset. We have hired someone to fill the position. Ms. Debbie Branton is a retired Marine Gunnery Sergeant, and she is currently working with the Border Patrol in Yuma, Arizona. She will be a tremendous asset, and we cannot wait until she comes on board. I also want to thank Commissioners Glessner and Spangler for helping with the interviews for this position.”

“Finally, the Curator position has been advertised and has closed. I have a very solid, diverse and experienced group of applicants from which to choose, and I plan on having that done and made public within the next month.”

## **IXV. Miscellaneous Task Force Update**

*Larry Catuzzi*

“Mr. Chairman, obviously the Task Force will be meeting tomorrow at our regularly scheduled time and regularly scheduled place. I would like to thank Joanne, Jeff, Ginger and the others for helping with our interviews for the Task Force Coordinator position, and relieving some of the pressure. We are happy that Gail Kemerer was available to join us. Gail will take on a broader role and responsibility than what Susie had. Her role will increase from what we have been doing in the past. When we first started and Susie was representing the families, it was a very emotional role that Susie played. Then we came together as a Task Force and her job expanded. Now we have embodied within the Task Force all of the consultants and the various committees. So this position is going to take a great deal of thought and sensitivity, and I think we have found the perfect person to do that in Gail. I would like to welcome Gail, and she will be housed here in the NPS offices. She will be hopefully supportive to the NPS, and they will be supportive of her.

We would like to present some type of honor to Susie at another time when she can join us.

The agenda for Saturday pretty well parallels what we have done in the past. Most of the committee reports that you heard today will be covered tomorrow as well.”

Chairman Reynolds: “Thank you.”

## **XV. Old Business**

### New Proposed Configuration for Commission/Task Force meetings beginning in 2005:

*Joanne Hanley*

“At the last Commission meeting, the Commissioners decided to postpone voting on combining the Task Force and Commission meetings. This would help to eliminate duplication, and sometimes triplication of efforts and time. Everybody agreed that they get tired of hearing the same thing two or three times.

The following schedule is given again to the Commissioners for their deliberation and vote. The following points were discussed at the last meeting, reflect the desire to “do it all in one day,” and should be considered in the Commission’s vote:

- It is important to have the confidential Commission pre-briefing BEFORE the Task Force briefing. Confidential information, the implications of which are necessary for understanding complex issues presented at the briefings, are more appropriate and valuable ahead of time.
- It is important to have the time necessary for thoughtful deliberation and dialogue at both the Task Force and Commission meeting, especially as activities are becoming more in-depth and comprehensive.
- Since the Commission is the legislated body with the authority to make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior and to Congress, their autonomy should be retained.”

As proposed:

<b>Friday Day</b>	<b>Optional Committee Meetings as Needed</b>
<b>Saturday AM</b>	<b>Confidential Commission Pre-Briefings 7:30 AM – 9:00 AM</b>
<b>Saturday AM</b>	<b>Task Force Meeting - Briefings and Reports 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM</b>
<b>Saturday Noon</b>	<b>Lunch 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM</b>
<b>Saturday PM</b>	<b>Commission Meeting - Deliberations and Vote 2:00 PM – 5:00 PM</b>

“I’ll turn the discussion of the chart over to Chairman Reynolds, but I would like to make one more point. I think that if we can agree on the following three points, we can be ready to move forward in January with the combined meetings:

- First, combine the meetings, combine the briefings,
- All activities except the optional committee meetings should take place on the same day, and
- Both the Commission and the Task Force meetings should be in one place for efficiency of work and economy of time.

If we can agree on those three points, then I would respectfully recommend that a local Commissioner and a local Task Force representative work with myself and Task Force Coordinator Gail Kemerer to find a suitable and acceptable location. So instead of deliberating on where we are going to have it, let us figure that out, and you just agree on the other three points.”

Commission members generally discussed the pros and cons of the combination suggestion.

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: “I think it is a wonderful idea.”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “Let me ask...I think this is fine, and obviously I like one day. For those of us who are coming in, we would have to come in on Friday anyway. Would there be any reason to have briefings Friday evening instead of Saturday? Saturday is going to be a very long day. I’m just saying that there are some people coming in on Friday that have to be here regardless. If the briefings could be held a little earlier the day before, we might get out earlier on Saturday.

Question from Commissioner Glessner: “To what briefings specifically are you referring?”

Answer from Commissioner Catuzzi: “The Commission briefings. When we first started before the Commission was a reality, Friday evening was a briefing period for the Task Force Executive Committee. We did much of the work of the Task Force on Friday evening, and then we started the Task Force meeting the next morning. We could have the briefings on Friday night for the Task Force, have the Task Force meeting in the morning, have a working lunch for the Commission meeting at 11:30 or noon, and then possibly end the day a little sooner. The

sequence would be Commission briefings, Task Force, and then Commission meeting. On Friday evenings, if you need it, you could have the pre-briefings.”

Question from Superintendent Hanley: “Let me see if we have this straight. Friday evening would be a confidential briefing?”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “It could be, yes it could be, or it can be at lunch, a working lunch.”

Comment from Commissioner Glass: “I thought I heard Larry say move the confidential Commission pre-briefings after the Task Force?”

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: “Maybe the word ”Commission” is throwing me off. I would just say the “confidential pre-briefings” because this morning we had a series of confidential briefings in which we got a lot of information that is sensitive and obviously subject to confidentiality. But because we had those confidential pre-briefings, we were able to easily transition into today’s meeting. Task Force members came and gave their briefings, which were very understandable by us because we had a lot of complexity explained before hand. So you have the confidential briefings, then you have the Task Force briefings, and then you have the briefings which require a vote. I think the order is important, not the time.”

Question from Commissioner Felt: “Don’t you think the confidential briefing should come after the Task Force briefings and reports?”

Answer from Superintendent Hanley: “What we did today was confidential briefing first, and then basically what could be called “Task Force briefings” second.”

Comment from Commissioner Sullivan: “I think the confidential briefings first might answer a lot of questions that might be raised in the public meetings.”

Comment from Commissioner Nacke: “I agree with Dan.”

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: “I’m suggesting maybe to shorten Saturday, and add it to Friday evening. I’m not changing anything here except to add a Friday evening confidential briefing.”

Comment from Commissioner Walker: “Two things. (1) How much work is still being done at the Task Force level; do we need four hours for the Task Force meeting? (2) If we start at 7:30 AM, I would prefer we not have a working lunch. I don’t think we would be very effective.”

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: “I think we can. I think both meetings could easily be done in three hours, each.”

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: “I concur. I know on Saturdays when the Task Force meets, they have their briefing and then they have their breakout meeting. That can add to your day. Can that get eliminated, or is that taken care of somewhere else?”

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: “I think what Joanne was thinking was if there needed to be some committee meetings, they could be done on Friday evenings. I assume that’s what you were saying?”

Answer from Superintendent Hanley: “Yes.”

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: “But I think John makes a good point. If you had ten hours, you’ll spend ten hours; if you had five hours, you would spend five hours; if you had three hours, you would do the job in three hours and hopefully do it in a better way and a simpler way. I think the Task Force, even with breakouts, can make good time.”

Comment from Commissioner Singel: “We have cut down on the breakouts. We haven’t had that at least the last two sessions.”

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: “We had them, but just for about an hour.”

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: “I would again, for my own clarification, request to use today as an example. We would have been briefed in the morning briefings with those briefings that don’t require a motion, i.e., the Archives did not have a motion, temporary memorial did not have a motion, the general management plan didn’t have a motion today, so that would be in the mornings. What would have been in the afternoon under the new proposal? There would have been all of the other committees that have motions, i.e., design solicitation, fundraising,

communications, is that correct? Is that your understanding? We are basically splitting the briefings into 'non-motion' and 'motion' presentations. The Task Force meetings would have "non-motion" briefings in the morning; the Commission meetings would hear those briefings requiring deliberation, 'motions,' and a vote in the afternoon."

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: "There is a change proposed as follows:

Confidential pre-briefing Friday night

Task Force meeting to 3 hours in the AM on Saturday

Lunch

Commission meeting in the PM on Saturday

Is that correct?"

Comment from Commissioner Felt: "I think that's good."

Question from Chairman Reynolds: "Is everyone on the same page?"

Answer from Commissioner Catuzzi: "The Task Force doesn't really have to have a lot of pre-briefing unless it is a very extraordinary situation, and that could be on a subject-by-subject basis. If we started at 8:30 AM with the Task Force meeting, and the committee made their reports and whatever they had to do until 11:30, we could then break and still have a working lunch where we would hear the Commission confidential pre-briefing reports at lunch. Then we could come back at 1:30 and we go until 4:30. People could possibly get away Saturday night if they had to."

Comment from Superintendent Hanley: "The morning then would be for briefings that have no motions and no issues; then we would have the confidential pre-briefings at lunch. In the afternoon we would hold those briefings that require a motion/vote and may have some issues?"

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: "Right, because some Commissioners would not need to be there on Saturday morning. Their critical need starts at 11:30, when we have the pre-briefing Commission lunch, which would go for two hours."

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: "Commissioners want to stay up-to-date on material that is going to be in front of the Commission two or three Commission meetings away, so they may indeed want to come for the Task Force briefings as well."

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: "I'm just saying that a Commissioner may want to come in on Saturday morning."

Question from Chairman Reynolds: "So let's repeat. So as I understand it is now:

8:00 to 11:00 will be Task Force briefings, i.e. those that do not require a motion or action by the Commission.

Lunch - 11:00 – 1:00 which includes confidential Commission pre-briefing

1:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. Commission meeting with motions that require deliberation and a vote.

#### **Motion 04-25 Regarding Combining the Commission and Task Force Meetings**

The Commission adopts the proposal to combine the Task Force and Commission briefings into one day as presented in the following chart, pending approval by the Task Force. The Commission directs that a local Commission member work with the Task Force and the NPS to determine an appropriate location. This will take effect at the next scheduled meeting on Saturday January 15, 2005.

<b>Friday Night</b>	<b>Optional Committee Meetings as Needed</b>
<b>Saturday AM 8:00 AM – 11:00 AM</b>	<b>Task Force Meeting Informational Briefings</b> (no motions or votes required)
<b>Saturday Lunch 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM</b>	<b>Working Lunch for the Commission Briefings on Confidential Issues</b>
<b>Saturday PM 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</b>	<b>Commission Meeting Commission Briefings, deliberations and votes</b>

Moved: Commissioner Gary Singel

Second: Commissioner John Felt

Discussion from the Commission:

No further discussion.

Discussion from the Public:

Question: "Will these meetings still be available to the public?"

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: "Yes, except between 11:00 A.M. and 1:00 P.M."

Question from the Public: "And do you have an estimate of how many people will attend because the Task Force numbers are normally about sixty people?"

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: "We will think about accommodating additional people when we select another location."

Vote: All in favor; none opposed

Motion passed unanimously

The next Task Force meeting will be on Saturday, January 15, 2005 at 8:00 a.m.

#### Report on Heinz History Center

*Jeff Reinbold*

"At the last Commission meeting we had a presentation from folks at the Heinz History Center (HHC) in Pittsburgh about a Smithsonian exhibit that was going to be there. Susie Hankinson, Joanne Hanley and I worked with them on a town meeting panel to be held on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. The HHC opened the exhibit on September 11<sup>th</sup>, and it runs through January. If you have an opportunity to go see it, I encourage you to do so. The exhibit also includes a section about Pennsylvania, and a lot of information about Flight 93.

On September 22<sup>nd</sup>, the HHC held a town hall meeting that included people speaking about how they were affected by September 11<sup>th</sup>. I sat on that panel; it was a very nice evening and it was an opportunity to talk about experiences from 9/11, but I was specifically asked to speak about the 9/11 memorial, how it was going, and how people can get involved. I understand they will send a donation to the memorial."

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: “There is actually a bus trip to the Heinz History Museum on November 6<sup>th</sup>, that leaves the Somerset Historical Center about 8:30 in the morning. It will visit the Heinz History Museum in the morning, and return in the evening.”

#### Follow-Up On 9/11

*Joanne Hanley*

“I would like us to take a few minutes to sit back and reflect on the experience that we had this past September 11th, and I would like to talk right now only about the Service of Remembrance, not about the press conference. I want to talk about how moving and emotional an event it was; yet at the same time it retained a lot of intimacy. Keith Newlin led our NPS incident command team and he made numerous staff available from both of his parks to help. The planning team for the Service of Remembrance had 15 NPS people on it which included Susan Bizon with three family members, Carol O’Hare, Debbie Borza and Esther Heymann; two local community members, Susie Hankinson and Donna Glessner; and Helene Fried as well. That does not include the dozens of volunteers who parked the cars, who showed people to their seats, and all the Ambassadors who helped out during the day. In addition, we had many NPS staff from Fort Necessity and Friendship Hill who came to help. In my opinion, the day was so successful because of the diversity of people we had in its planning. In particular, it made the world of difference to have the family members on the planning team with us. My recommendation is that from here on out, a standing committee of family representatives always helps plan the service every anniversary. I understand that the family board discussed this at their last meeting. I think their participation made a tremendous impact on how well the service was received by the other family members. Some of the highlights of the day included two very moving and emotional songs. One song in particular, “Don’t Be Afraid”, is an original song written by the Bruderhof children for the families.

Another highlight of the day was when Commissioner Pamela Tokar-Ickes gave her heartfelt remarks. It was so incredible. I want to say thanks to everyone who contributed to making it so successful.”

(Applause from the Commission and the Public).

#### **XVI. New Business**

##### Discovery Channel Documentary

*Joanne Hanley*

The Discovery Channel contacted the families to let them know that they are planning and are very interested in producing a documentary about Flight 93, and its lasting contributions to the country. Joanne read from a letter that Discovery wrote to the families, “They intend to capture the moment of true heroism and patriotism, and wish to involve all of the families in the collaborative process of creating it. They believe it will be a powerful tool and a moving tribute to everyone who was on board and on the ground and an inspiration to all who see it. The company that the Discovery Channel has selected to make the film, Brook Lapping Productions of London (“BLP”), is among the most distinguished documentary producers in the world, described in September 2002 by the Wall Street Journal as ‘the Rolls Royce of documentary makers.’ Discovery also has a special relationship to the story because the company lost one of its employees, Elizabeth Wainio, on Flight 93. It is thus with the greatest care and compassion that the company wishes to document this historic and inspiring event for this generation and beyond,

and we respectfully ask your cooperation. With the help of the families, they believe they can tell the stories of the heroes and loved ones.”

Chairman Reynolds introduced and acknowledged the representatives from Discovery and from Brook Lapping, including Carrie Watkins, Discovery; Phil Craig, Phil Marlow, Bruce Goodison and Christine Bavetta, Brook Lapping Productions. The Brook Lapping representatives came from England.

Chairman Reynolds noted that Discovery has a special relationship with the NPS, as they are a “Proud Partner” of the National Park Foundation.

*Phil Craig, Brook Lapping Productions*

Phil Craig thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak today. He discussed the fact that it will take many months to put the documentary together. They are very honored that an American firm would ask them, a British company, to help to tell the story of Flight 93. The scale of the ambition was greatly impressed upon him, and the gravity of the event made him wish to express his gratitude. BLP is known for making serious, ambitious films, and they want to apply a strong level of objectivity, clarity and coolness in their approach to this project. With the passing of the last two to three years, the amount of data available to tell a clear and concise story is immediately available.

It allows for a powerful story of in terms of hope against horror. It also allows for input into a historic event, and the opportunity to work with the families makes the project all the more important and relative. Bruce Goodison, the director, and Christina Bavetta, the assistant director and others were introduced. They stressed that it is impossible to make this project without the support of the families and the communities as well, in order to make this film the kind everyone would want to see and be proud of.

(Audience applause.)

Chairman Reynolds thanked everyone for his or her attachment and commitment to this project.

Thanks and Acknowledgements

*Joanne Hanley*

Joyce Boone was given acknowledgment of her service to the NPS, the Commission, the Task Force and the Families. Chairman Reynolds added his thanks as well. Her work and dedication has been tremendous.

A gift of appreciation was announced for Susie Hankinson, and in her absence it was saved for the next meeting.

Keith Newlin received the newly created “Keith Award,” for outstanding incident commander on September 11, 2004. “He’s the man!”

**XVII. Public Comment Period**

None

## **XVIII. Wrap-Up and Meeting Adjournment**

Commissioner Catuzzi had final remarks of heartfelt thanks for the assistance and camaraderie of the Commission over the last year and a half, in particular, those Commissioners who are not family members, Brent Glass, Dan Sullivan, Donna Glessner, Jerry Spangler, Greg Walker, Pam Tokar-Ickes, Gary Singel, Ed Linenthal, Mike Watson and John Reynolds. He urged everyone to stay diligent with the process, and to stay focused on its import. Their work is sincerely appreciated, and he looks forward to continued work and success.

Chairman Reynolds acknowledged that the Commission shares Commissioner Catuzzi's feelings. There are strong feelings of family and friendship, and commitment to this very important work. He gave everyone holiday wishes.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 P.M.

Minutes prepared by:

**JAMISON PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

531 Forest Parkway, Suite 200

Forest Park, Georgia 30297

(404) 363-6894

(404) 363-0130 (fax)