

Minutes of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission
July 30, 2004
10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Minutes prepared by Joanne Hanley, National Park Service

Meeting called to order at 10:00 AM by Chairman John Reynolds.

Commissioners Present

Dr. Brent Glass
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

I. Opening of Meeting and Pledge of Allegiance

Joanne Hanley led the Pledge of Allegiance. Observation of moment of silence was held as people saw appropriate, especially to the heroes of Flight 93.

II. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

Chairman John Reynolds welcomed all the Commissioners and everyone else who was present.

Formal introduction of Commission members followed. Chairman Reynolds thanked Vice-Chair Donna Glessner for conducting the May 14, 2004 meeting in his absence. He indicated that some extremely important things have happened since the last meeting. The content of our meetings is becoming deeper and deeper, and is requiring more and more thought. He thanked all of those who participated actively in the committee meetings since the last Commission meeting for their time and energy, including the consultants.

Superintendent 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.

Superintendent Hanley explained the handouts to the Commissioners, including the availability of Somerset County phonebooks thanks to the generosity of the County. She

instructed Commissioners to give their lunch money to Joyce, and to get their travel in to Joyce as well ASAP.

III. Review and Approval of Minutes

Motion 04-14 Regarding Approval of Minutes from July 30, 2004

Motion: The Commission approves the minutes of July 30, 2004, as amended.

Moved: Commissioner Catuzzi

Second: Commissioner Singel

Discussion from Commissioners:

None

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

Motion passes.

Commissioner Catuzzi thanked Superintendent Hanley and staff for the completeness of the minutes. The Commissioners all appreciate the fact that they can go back and read and remember what happened. The minutes are very useful.

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

A. Resource Assessment Committee; Boundary Recommendation

Randy Cooley had submitted a report that focused on all of the activities of the Resource Assessment Committee, but Jeff Reinbold indicated that today's focus would be on the boundary recommendation that the Commission is charged with making to the Secretary of the Interior by September 25, 2005.

Jeff Reinbold gave a brief power point presentation and review on the boundary; what it means, how we got there, and what the final recommendation is; his "Boundary 101" presentation, much of which was review for the Commissioners. His presentation included the following:

The Boundary

- Land may only be purchased from a willing seller (P.L. 107-226)
- Boundary defines the amount in which land or an interest in land that the federal government may acquire
- NPS can only acquire or accept land or an interest in land within the authorized boundary
- Boundaries often include both federal and private lands
- Private lands within the boundary have no inherent restrictions placed on them
- If a landowner would like the option to sell or donate land or an interest in land, the property must be within the boundary

Priorities

- Core Resources – the crash site and debris field protected in fee
- Visitor Areas – lands for visitor facilities, experience, and access acquired in fee

- Setting – critical foreground views and lands necessary to provide an appropriate setting for the national memorial protected in less-than-fee or fee

The following summarizes the major steps taken in boundary development, including landowner meetings and Commission field trips:

- 11/14/03 Advisory Commission adopts Resolution 03 01, recommending approximately 1500 acres for inclusion in an “interim boundary.” These lands were the minimum required to protect resources and serve the visitor. The impact site especially needs immediate protection. Commission requests the option to come back with a final boundary recommendation after further study.
- 1/27/04 Meeting with NPS Director and staff on boundary recommendation. Director agrees with the immediate protection of the core impact area, but requests that the Commission not submit both an “interim” and a “final” boundary, but just do it once, and do it right. Requested the Commission go back and ensure that all of the lands that need to be in the boundary to protect the site are included, and to approve a boundary recommendation by July 30, 2004.
- 4/15/04 NPS held a “neighbors” meeting with all landowners within approximately 2 miles of the site to describe the boundary process, as well as answer any questions on land acquisition.
- 4/20/04 Flight 93 Advisory Commission sponsored a daylong workshop/field trip for task force members, community members, and others to examine every possible need for inclusion in the boundary.
- 5/17 – 7/29/04 Individual landowner meetings with every landowner potentially included in the boundary, either as fee, or easement.
- 6/11 – 6/12/04 Community workshops to describe planning process, including boundary process.
- 6/15/04 Briefing with Lynn Scarlett, Assistant Secretary, DOI, to present boundary update and process.
- 7/14/04 Commission site visit to ground truth final boundary needs.
- 7/30/04 Presentation of final boundary recommendation to the Commission.

Motion 04 15

The Flight 93 Advisory Commission accepts for consideration the recommended boundary of the Flight 93 National Memorial as depicted on Map 04 01.

Moved: Commissioner Jerry Spangler

Second: Commissioner Ken Nacke

Discussion from Commission:

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: This motion takes the recommendation from the Resource Assessment Committee and places it in front of the Commission.

Question from Joanne Hanley: Should the word be "receive" rather than "accept," which only connotes approval.

Discussion from the Public:

None

Motion as amended:

The Flight 93 Advisory Commission receives and accepts for consideration the recommended boundary of the Flight 93 National Memorial as depicted on Map 04 01.

Moved: Commissioner Jerry Spangler

Second: Commissioner Larry Catuzzi

Discussion from Commission:

None

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

Chairman Reynolds requested that the minutes reflect the hard work that the Commissioners did on the Resource Assessment Committee, as well as Jeff's hard work, and the Commissioner's hard work to get this boundary done and in front of the Commission for a final vote. All of the work has led us to a better proposal.

Commissioner Catuzzi looked back to a year ago, when Randy Cooley stepped up to be the Chair of the Resource Assessment Committee. He indicated he appreciated Mr. Cooley's leadership on the Committee.

Jeff Reinbold thanked one of our consultants, Dr. Merlin Paulson, who did the visual simulations and pulled them all together. Jeff also thanked all of the landowners for their patience, for attending meetings, and for asking all the right questions. He indicated they are a wonderful group of people.

Resolution 04 01, formally recommends the boundary to the Secretary of the Interior and follows. Map 04 01, accompanies the resolution, (**Attachment 1** to the minutes). Chair Donna Glessner read the resolution.

**Resolution 0401
of the
FLIGHT 93 ADVISORY COMMISSION
July 30, 2004**

WHEREAS, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission was established pursuant to Public Law 107-226, The Flight 93 National Memorial Act; and,

WHEREAS, Section 4 (i)(2) of Public Law 107-226 provides that the Commission shall advise the Secretary of the Interior on the establishment of boundaries for the Flight 93 National Memorial; and,

WHEREAS, at its meeting of November 14, 2003, the Commission adopted a resolution advising the Secretary of the Interior that the properties consisting of the site of the impact of Flight 93, properties in the view shed of the impact site, and properties associated with entry from Route 30 will be included as a portion of the ultimate boundary that the Advisory Commission will recommend to the Secretary in its final report; and

WHEREAS, the Commission requested in the above referenced resolution that the Secretary of the Interior exercise the authority granted pursuant to Section 5 of Public Law 107-226, which is to acquire from willing sellers the land or interest in land for the memorial by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange; and

Whereas, the Commission, upon further consultation and review, now desires to recommend the boundary for the Flight 93 National Memorial to the Secretary of the Interior.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLIGHT 93 ADVISORY COMMISSION THAT:

1. Pursuant to Section 4(i)(2) of Public Law 107-226, enacted by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of establishing the Flight 93 National Memorial, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission advises the Secretary of the Interior on the establishment of the boundary to constitute the Flight 93 National Memorial as contained on Map 04 01 attached to this resolution, and that said boundary shall be included in the Commission's final report to the Secretary.
2. The Flight 93 Advisory Commission requests that the Secretary of the Interior, upon approval of the Flight 93 National Memorial boundary, attached hereto, exercise the authority granted pursuant to Section 5 of Public Law 107-226 relating to lands within said boundary and such subsurface mineral estates external to such boundary including those mineral rights described in the Somerset County Recorder of Deeds Office in Deed Book Volume 1728, Page 232, as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to protect the resources of the National Memorial.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission requests that the National Park Service work in partnership with others to foster a compatible relationship between the Flight 93 National Memorial and lands external to the boundary, the use of which may affect the experience of visitors or the protection of resources within the National Memorial. The Commission requests the NPS to consider such partnering in the development of the General Management Plan.

Moved: Commissioner Jerry Spangler

Second: Commissioner Cal Wilson

Discussion from Commission:

Question from Commissioner Wilson: When this goes forward to the Secretary, does this mark the end of us setting the boundary.

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: Yes.

Question from Commissioner Spangler: Does this go to the Secretary right away?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: We will immediately begin moving it forward through the proper channels; Regional Director, Director, Assistant Secretary, Secretary. Then it will be published in the federal register.

Question from Commissioner Glessner: Does this authorize the NPS land acquisition people to begin working with these additional properties right away, or not until the Secretary approves it?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: They can begin the pre-acquisition work, but they cannot buy land, similar to the comparable work they are doing on the other properties.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: How long will the process take before we hear back from the Secretary?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: It is a long process to get a meeting with her and to get all of the right people in Washington briefed. Joanne took a guess that it will be more than a couple of months; at least a few. A lot of the people up and down the line have already been briefed; there will be no surprises. It's just a matter of timing and getting on people's schedules as versus any opposition to this.

Comment from Commissioner Felt: Will it make it easier if there is more explanation in the resolution outlining the process that we actually followed? This is important, especially since it was in the legislation. He wanted to be sure the entire story of this effort is incorporated in some fashion to the Secretary.

Answer from Terry Moore and Joanne Hanley: Yes. They will put together an entire briefing package that describes the entire reasoning, background, criteria and rationale for the boundary. They then will brief in Washington in person, all the way up and down the chain of command.

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: He indicated that he would like to request the NPS to ensure that Commissioner Felt's concerns are met in terms of preparing a briefing package for the Secretary to accompany the resolution, and that the process is communicated all the way up the line to the Secretary.

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: The Commissioners should also understand that while this recommendation sets the boundaries, it in no way says that the discussions have ended. There still are many issues with which to deal.

Comment from Vice-Chair Glessner: She conveyed that she felt very proud of the work that was done. It challenged all of us to think in terms of the future, that most of us don't do. We looked at development pressures that may come years down the road; way beyond our lifetime. She feels very good; it is a common sense boundary based on logic and supported.

Comment from Commissioner Ken Nacke: This all started with Josh First from the Conservation Fund two years ago; and was continued by Randy Cooley. It is an honor and a pleasure to be involved with all the people that have been involved. He said thanks; it opened his eyes since he saw its progress from the beginning. Ken thanked Jeff for all his hard work.

Discussion from the Public:

None.

Several technical revisions were incorporated into the resolution and presented.

Resolution 04 01 as amended was moved to be approved by Commissioner Brent Glass, and the second was by Commissioner Larry Catuzzi.

Vote: all in favor; none opposed.

Resolution passes.

Chairman Reynolds had one final comment. He spent his entire professional life in the NPS. One of the most important things one can do for the future of the United States is to create a new national park. Flight 93 is a park commemorating our heritage forever. This process in which everyone participated is in fact, the creation of a real piece of land that is incredibly important to this nation, to the family members, and to future generations. There are few things that are more important than to understand what happens in the history of our country. This is giving something to the future of America. While this is a personal statement, he wanted to share it.

B. Lands Update

Joanne Hanley reported on the status of the NPS and Conservation Fund land acquisition process. Progress is now being reported by parcel rather than by landowner, because each landowner may own several parcels. On any given parcel, we may be at a different stage of pre-acquisition or acquisition. The NPS is working on 9 parcels. The Conservation fund is working on the remaining 16 parcels (except for relocation, on which the NPS is working on 24 parcels).

**National Park Service - Northeast Region Realty Division
Flight 93 National Memorial Realty Process Status 07/30/04**

Owners Consent to Proceed	8 of 9 parcels*
Legal Description	6 of 9 parcels*
Title Evidence Ordered	8 of 9 parcels*
Title Evidence Received	8 of 9 parcels*
Environmental Site Assessment Ordered	8 of 9 parcels*
Environmental Site Assessment Approved	0 of 9 parcels*
Requested Funds for Appraisals	4 of 9 parcels*
Appraisal Received	0 of 9 parcels*
Offer Package Sent	0 of 9 parcels*
Offer Package Accepted	0 of 9 parcels*
Closing Ordered	0 of 9 parcels*
Closing Complete	0 of 9 parcels*
Relocation Action Initiated	14 of 24 parcels*
Relocation Action Completed	0 of 24 parcels*

*Of the twenty four Somerset County Tax Parcels currently identified for inclusion into Flight 93 National Memorial, the National Park Service, Northeast Region Realty Division is handling the acquisition of nine of these parcels.

The Conservation Fund

Flight 93 National Memorial Realty Process Status 07/30/04

Owners Consent to Proceed	15 of 16 parcels*
Environmental Site Assessment	14 of 16 parcels*
Appraisal Received	15 of 16 parcels*
Offer Package Sent	15 of 16 parcels*
Offer Package Accepted	13 of 16 parcels*
Closing Ordered	2 of 16 parcels*
Closing Complete	2 of 16 parcels*

*Of the twenty four Somerset County Tax Parcels currently identified for inclusion into Flight 93 National Memorial, The Conservation Fund is handling the acquisition of 16 of these parcels in addition to having completed the acquisition of the drag lines.

Todd McNew of the Conservation Fund showed a map to illustrate progress on the parcels on which they are working. The Conservation Fund bought the draglines. They closed on a large mineral tract (minerals under the ground). They are working on a large transaction with PBS Coal Company, which is under contract; anticipated closing is next year. They also received a donation from Consol Coal Company.

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: We need to underscore the fact that the money the County has transitioned to the NPS for land acquisition is not County money, but private funds sent in over the course of the last couple of years. This is the money that came from faceless, nameless individuals who had no agenda and no other reason to give than to just reach out and do something. This is the significant investment that the American people made in this.

C. Planning Process/General Management Plan (GMP) Update

Jeff Reinbold went over the very familiar integrated planning process chart we have been using for the past year, and the status of the activities on the chart. The GMP committee has not met yet, but will meet in August. The focus right now has been the boundary, as well as getting the design competition started.

Accomplishments:

Creating a Vision and Mission Statement complete.

Resources are being assessed on site for the Environmental Impact Assessment.

Design competition process is being designed; will begin on September 11, 2004.

Looking ahead:

By the next Commission meeting in October, there will be an approved boundary; there will be an approved mission statement; the design competition will have begun; competitors will have visited the site.

By the January Commission meeting, designs will be here at which to look.

This time next year, we will be looking at the finalists.

We have come a long way. There is a lot on the horizon. Within the year, we will have the design for the memorial and the recommendations for the entire site. We need to acknowledge a lot of the people that helped us to get to this point, especially in the months immediately after the crash. The Ambassadors picked up the reins of talking to visitors. Also Stonycreek Township and Somerset County stepped up to help when there was no rulebook to follow. In hindsight, they made all the right decisions that allowed us to get to this point.

Jeff went over the donation of a terrain model by:

BAE Systems of San Diego, CA, a defense and aerospace contractor and is contributing the satellite image-enhanced solid terrain model

Solid Terrain Modeling of Fillmore, CA, is assisting with the development and manufacturing of the solid terrain model

Digital Globe of Longmont, CO, is providing the 60-centimeter high resolution satellite imagery

They donated a 3D-terrain model with a 3-D satellite image overlaid. It will be full color and 3' x 4'. This will be helpful to competitors to visualize the site, and for us to explain the site and terrain.

Commissioner Catuzzi requested that we send a thank you note to the firms who donated the materials and services.

D. Mission Statement/Memorial Ideas Committee Update

Presented by Jerry Spangler and Esther Heymann.

Commissioner Spangler spoke about the humbling and rewarding experience working on the mission statement/memorial ideas committee. There were a number of people involved who displayed much creativity, enthusiasm and commitment. In December 2001, we brought in people from Oklahoma City to share their experiences. That was the first time people in this community had an inkling that we were embarking on something so immense. Then we went to Oklahoma City in May of 2003, and we learned much about how basic and fundamental the mission statement process is. It is a way of identifying what the memorial is all about.

The process has been open to the public; we used modern technology on the internet and website; we had town meetings in Shanksville and around the country.

The draft that we are presenting is a best effort with a lot of input. It has been rewarding. Process is important. We get the best results from a lot of input from a variety of sources. Today we are starting to see the convergence of much work – the mission statement will be used in fundraising, in memorial design, and in the GMP.

It's also been reviewed by a professional editor. (**See Attachment 2**).

Commissioner Linenthal spoke about the remarkable job that Jerry and Esther led, on what is a very difficult thing to do. They were sensitive to a variety of comments that came in, yet still shaped a coherent and compelling document. They should be thanked, as well as their whole committee. This could evolve forever, but at some point we need to stop and say enough - this is the scripture which we go by – and it does what we need to do.

Commissioner Nacke said that the committee put the passion into the words, even though he had doubts it could be done. They harnessed the passion. Chairman Reynolds added that when the families heard it at their meeting in San Francisco, they also felt the same way.

Commissioner Glass echoed what was said around the table, and thanked everyone. He said writing history is not easy, but especially history that carries a message to a number of audiences that will read this.

Motion 04 16 Regarding the Mission Statement

The Flight 93 Advisory Commission approves 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 motion is conditioned upon concurrent approval of the document at the meeting of the Task Force scheduled for July 31, 2004.

Moved: Chairman Brent Glass

Second: Chairman Ed Linenthal

Discussion from the Commission:

None

Discussion from the Public:

Comment from Ben Wainio: All committee member names should be read into the minutes.

Vote: all in favor; none opposed.
Motion passes.

The following members of the Mission Statement/Memorial Ideas Committee are commended, thanked and appreciated for all of their hard work:

Co-Chairs Jerry Spangler and Esther Heymann

Betty Kemmerer

Laura Brough

Catherine Stefani

Rick King

Jill Miller

Karen Model

Holly McKenzie

Barbara Black

Jeff Reinbold

Gina Farfour

Tim Baird

Susan Hankinson

Pamela Tokar-Ickes

Christine Homer

Angelo Armenti

Edward Linenthal

Terry Shaffer

Kathie Shaffer

Brent Glass

Rose Sprock

Nancy Goodwin

Charles Fox

Patrick White

Donna Glessner

Tom Maust

Carol O'Hare

E. Design Solicitation Committee Update

Co-Chairs Tim Baird and Gina Farfour gave this presentation.

The Design Oversight Committee, Gina Farfour, Tim Baird, Calvin Wilson and Jeff Reinbold, have been working closely with the consultants. Tim thanked everyone who gave input into the competition materials. Everyone worked hard in giving thoughtful comments. Tim thanked Ken Nacke who invited them to go to San Francisco last week to meet with the west coast families. The NPS, and Helene and Ken's committee, were extremely well organized, especially in press conference events. 34/35 media markets in San Francisco were represented.

Gina talked about the large task of organizing volunteers for every facet of the design competition, and made a plea for volunteers.

Don Stastny and Helene Fried gave an update on the status of the design competition. Don addressed the fundamental question of how to create an environment that will foster the exploration to design a brilliant memorial. They brought their passion and

experience to this task. They believed they designed a program that will allow for the exploration of ideas leading to the delivery of the answer for which they are searching.

The Moving Parts

- Mission Statement
- Design Program
- Competition Process
- Competition Regulations
- Competition Schedule
- Competition Budget
- Jury Selection Protocol
- Communication Strategy
- Design/Packaging/Distribution

Competition Manual: Table of Contents

- Invitation to Participate
- Overview
- The Mission Statement
- Creating a Memorial, the First Steps
- The Community
- The Environment
- The Design Program
- Design Competition Regulations
- Design Competition Schedule
- Maps and Aerial Photograph
- Sources of Additional Information
- Photo Credits and Donor Recognition
- DVD/CD of Site and Context

1. Competition Procedure

- Call for Entries
- Registration of Participant
- Stage I Competition Period
- Question and Answer Period
- Site Visits - Stage I
- Submission of Stage I Entries
- Late Entries
- Stage I Evaluation and Selection
- Stage II Competition Briefing
- Site Master Plan Workshop
- Stage II Competition Period
- Question and Answer Periods
- Site Visits - Stage II
- Submission of Stage II Designs
- Stage II Evaluation and Selection
- Partners Approval and Adoption
- Public Exhibition of Design Competition

2. Communications

- No communication except as provided in the Competition Regulations
- Information solicitation should be made only to the Competition Advisors
- Complying questions will be answered during designated Q & A periods
- Answers become part of Competition Program

3. Stage 1 Anonymity

- Entries shall bear no marks of identification
- No communications except as authorized in the Competition Regulations
- Violations render disqualification from Competition
- Participants remain anonymous to the Stage I Jury until Stage II Participants have been chosen

4. Requirements for Stage 1 Design Submissions

- One (1) mounted board
 - Title and drawing scale on all drawings
 - Overall site plan
 - Sections, elevations, or perspectives as desired
 - Narrative to explain how the entry addresses the Mission Statement
 - Envelope with participant's name adhered to back

5. Requirements for Stage 2 Design Submissions

- Maximum of four (4) mounted boards
- Three-dimensional architectural model
- Information for 3D computer modeling
- Full team of professionals to implement the design
- Detailed construction budget
- Specific Stage II submission requirements will be based on the scope and content of the Stage I design entries

6. Eligibility

- Open to all who register according to the Competition Regulations
- No professional design qualification requirement in Stage I
- Professional design team required for Stage II to ensure constructability of design
 - Composition and criteria of team to be established at the Stage II Competition Briefing
 - Assistance will be provided to non-professionals if requested
- Members of affiliated organizations and their staff consultants, committees, subcommittees or task forces are not eligible to participate

7. Competition Honoraria

- \$25,000 Honorarium for Stage II participants
- Paid upon submission of design concept in compliance with the competition regulations
- No compensation for Stage I participants

8. Disqualification

- Design Oversight Committee has final determination

- Competition Advisors forward matters and present their findings to the Design Oversight Committee for final action
- Any act by a registrant in conflict with the competition regulations is grounds for disqualification

9. Stage 1 Jury

Appointed by the Flight 93 Advisory Commission:

- Two (2) members of the Families of Flight 93
- Four (4) design professionals
- Three (3) members of the local and larger national community
 - Two of which may be drawn from the Partners
- One (1) non-voting recorder

•

10. Stage 2 Jury

Appointed by the Flight 93 Advisory Commission with recommendations by the Design Oversight Committee:

- Eight (8) members of the Families of Flight 93 and Partners
- Seven (7) additional members
 - Including design professionals and civic leaders from the local and national community
- One (1) non-voting recorder

11. Role of the Competition Advisors

Retained by the Partners to:

- Oversee the Design Competition procedure
- Be the sole contact for Participants
- Organize and coordinate all activities of the Competition
- Facilitate meetings as required

12. Ownership of Entries and Submissions

- All materials submitted to the Competition will be donated to the Archives to be permanently housed in the Flight 93 National Memorial Archives.

13. Exhibition of Entries and Submittals

- The Families of Flight 93 and the Partners reserve the right to exhibit, use, or display all materials submitted for education, publication, documents, videos, or fund-raising
- Designer/author retains copyright
- Appropriate credit will be given to authors of any materials used

14. Agreement

- Negotiated contract between Memorial Designer and the National Park Service
 - Designer to provide professional services to implement the design
 - National Park Service in charge of construction and management
- Construction may be phased as funds become available
- The Families of Flight 93 and the Partners reserve the right to request modifications and the right not to proceed

15. Competition Schedule

Competition Registration Begins	Sept 11, 2004
Site Visits	Oct 2, 2004
	Oct 21, 2004
	Nov 13, 2004
Question/Answer Period I	
• Last Day to Submit Questions	Nov 15, 2004
• Response to Questions Distributed	Dec 5, 2004
Competition Registration Ends	Dec 27, 2004
Stage I Design Entries Due	January 11, 2005
Exhibition of Stage I Design Entries	
• Family and Partners Private Viewing	Jan15-18, 2005
• Public Viewing	Jan19-23, 2005
• Stage I Jury Viewing and Deliberations	Jan 24-26, 2005
• Ongoing Public Viewing	Jan 27-Feb 26 2005
Selection of Stage II Participants	January 27, 2005
Announcement of Stage II Participants	February 4, 2005
Briefing and Master Plan	Feb 24-25, 2005
• Workshop for Stage II Participants	
Question/Answer Period II	
• Last Day to Submit Questions	March 18, 2005
• Response to Questions Distributed	March 25, 2005
Question/Answer Period III	
• Last Day to Submit Questions	April 15, 2005
• Response to Questions Distributed	April 22, 2005
Stage II Design Submission Due	June 15, 2005
Technical Evaluations	June 16-22, 2005
Exhibition of Stage II Design Submissions	
• Stage I Jury Confirmation	June 23, 2005
• Family and Partners Private Viewing	June 24-29, 2005
• Public Viewing	July 1-30, 2005
• Stage 2 Jury Viewing and Deliberations	August 1-3, 2005
Preparation of Jury Report	August 4-14, 2005
Presentation of Jury Decision to Partners	Aug15-Sept.2, 2005
Announcement of Selected Memorial Design	Sept 11, 2005
Public Exhibition of Competition	Aug15-Sep 30 2005

16. Design Program

- Opportunity to present design ideas for a *memorial expression* that portrays the Mission Statement
- Site Organization Diagram provides guidance for an appropriate visitor experience
- Participants can locate their *memorial expression* in any of the organizational zones
- Participants are welcome to suggest modification of the organizational zones

THE GATEWAY

- Entrance to the National Memorial from Route 30
- Includes land north and south of Route 30
- Orient visitors and provide limited services
- Any shuttle service would depart and return to this area

BETWEEN THE GATEWAY AND THE BOWL

- Experience natural and reclaimed landscapes
- Reclamation work will be completed prior to construction but will not include significant changes to the land contours, site grading, vegetation, or removal of certain buildings

THE BOWL

- Defined by higher elevations of land on north and west
- Includes the part of and provides views to the Sacred Ground
- Location of the Temporary Memorial
- Skyline Road will be closed to through traffic and specific treatments to be explored in Stage II

THE RIDGE

- Opportunity to interpret the messages contained in the Mission Statement
- Higher ground provides views of the crash site
- Interpretive exhibits could be in structures or the landscape
- Possible location for Visitor Center, Collections Facility, and parking
- Accessible pathways could start and return to this zone

SACRED GROUND

- Includes actual crash site, debris field, and grove of hemlock trees impacted by the crash
- Final resting place of those on Flight 93 - no public access
- Intervention in this area should be treated in a sensitive manner and honor the wishes of the families

17. Planned Facilities

- Memorial Expression
- Visitor Information Center
- Possible Maintenance Facility
- Possible Archival and Collections Storage
- Roads, trails, and parking
- Competitors are not required to use or design these facilities but may include them to strengthen their *memorial expression* if so desired

18. Stewardship of the Environment

- The National Memorial should respect and maintain natural landscapes
- Development should be of high standards of sustainable design
- Site has been dramatically altered by mining - current plant life are a result of reclamation
- Peaceful and tranquil landscapes valued by the families of Flight 93 and other visitors

19. Jury Selection Protocol

- Stage I Jury Composition
- Stage II Jury Composition
- General Criteria
- Selection of the Juries
- Designing the Juries
- A Recommendation

20. General Criteria for Jury Members

- Properly interpret and respect the Mission Statement
- Recognize and adhere to the Design Competition Rules and Regulations
- Respect and hold as equals the other members of the Jury
- Promote and practice the highest levels of personal and professional integrity
- Rigorously examine and evaluate the submissions entered in competition

21. Selection of the Juries

- The Competition Advisors identify general categories
- Names that correspond to each of the categories are gathered from:
 - Families of Flight 93
 - Professional Design Disciplines
 - From Community members
 - National Park Service
 - Flight 93 Task Force
 - and others

21. Designing the Juries

- Identify Jury groups comprised of members who will work together to maintain the integrity of the process and reach consensus
- Selection is based on each suggested Juror's personal and professional experience, abilities, communication skills, stamina, and personality
- Consideration is also given to cultural diversity, gender, and other qualities

22. A Recommendation

- The Competition Advisors recommend Jurors for Stage I and Stage II to the Design Oversight Committee
- Recommendation is reviewed by the Committee and its constituent Partner groups
- Final Juror recommendation forwarded to the Flight 93 Advisory Commission
- The Advisory Commission approves the recommendation and extends a formal invitation to each Juror

After Don's presentation, Helene Fried showed the Commission a mock-up of the design competition folder. She explained what would be in the folder:

- A color map
- A CD that shows the landscape of the site
- The actual competition manual itself, which will include an aerial photograph, more color maps, criteria, parameters, the mission statement and other detailed information.

Helene spoke about communications and the launch of the design competition. There will be a press conference in NYC, as well as one in the Somerset area. There will be a full press packet to go along with the press briefing. The website will have all the information about registration on the site.

If anyone has a competition idea for the memorial, they should be encouraged to register. If anyone has ANY questions, send them to the website or to the special 800 number (800 244 6515).

Don and Helen thanked the design oversight committee and all the partners for their involvement.

Question from Commission Catuzzi: How do you control anonymity in the original registration?

Answer from Don Stastny: As someone registers, they are given a registration number. The number is the key to their identification with the juries, even though we have their name and address on file to receive information. Don and Helene ensure that the address corresponds to the number assigned. The number will be on the back of the design board. Just Helene and Don will know who the registrants are.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: Please explain the point you made that competitors will not be required to provide details in regard to other facilities, i.e. visitor center.

Answer from Don Stastny: We are looking for a specific design of the "memorial expression." Registrants are only being asked to place the other facilities on the site as part of the larger plan for the park. Someone may decide however, that in order to have the appropriate memorial expression, they need to have the VC there to frame it. In that case, they may include a VC, but in no case is anyone required to design it.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: What if someone submits just a memorial expression without a site plan? If we like the memorial expression, how do we compare them to the submissions with a full plan as well?

Answer from Don Stastny: If their idea of the memorial expression is one of the top five, stage 1 jury can move them forward into stage 2. If they don't have a planning team behind them (and they designed their expression on the kitchen table for example), we will put a team together for them in stage 2. This is by far the hardest design competition we have taken on because of the scale of the national park, and because of how we need to work to have a level playing field for fairness of submissions.

Question from Commissioner Spangler: What role will the Commission have in commenting on the designs.

Answer from Helene Fried: The Commission will have three roles in addition to reviewing the submissions. First will be to consider jury members from stage 1 and stage 2; second will be to consider the three to five finalists that will move on to stage 2; and finally to consider the finalist.

Question from Commissioner Nacke: Will the Commission get some of the same training that juries will get so we can understand what they are looking at, how they are looking at it, and how they come to their decisions?

Answer from Helene Fried: Yes. They will prepare the Commission to consider all of the materials upon which we need to make decisions.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: By October 2005, does the NPS then jump in to bids etc. and start to work the construction side?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: She indicated that they are working with their contracting office right now so that in 10/05, we can take the concept drawings of the "winner" and turn them into much more detailed design drawings, and then into construction drawings. They (contracting) are helping us to follow a correct process so that should we want to have the chosen "finalist" be the one to prepare the design drawings, we can do that, be in good shape, and jump right into it.

Answer from Jeff Reinbold: Jeff and Joanne just went to Denver this week, for the purpose of meeting with contracting to ensure that the transition is as seamless as possible so we can get right into final drawings.

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: That seamless movement is dependent upon design money. NPS needs to start making sure there is design money in 10/05.

Comment from Commission Catuzzi: We all need to realize that the families will be anxious to move after the design selection, so we need to be able to act quickly.

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: Where will the designs be submitted? Where do they go?

Answer from Helene: The registrations as well as the submissions will come here to the Somerset office and be forwarded to us.

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: The volunteers that we are putting together are very important. The process that we are going through will require volunteers to put up the displays so they can be reviewed. The plea today is to go out and address the community and get new volunteers. Not necessarily getting the same ones that we always rely on. We will need to get these displays off the trucks, tag them and display them. This will be complicated and will require even carpenters to build displays. Then we need to take them down and take them to the archives.

Question from Ben Wainio, family member: When family members apply for jury membership, do they apply for a certain jury, or do Don and Helene decide on which jury they will serve?

Answer from Helene Fried: We will place them appropriately as we design for area of expertise, personality, etc. We encourage all family members individually to apply if they are interested, but the likelihood of having more than one family member on any jury is slight.

Comment from Commissioner Linenthal: When the boards went on display in Oklahoma City, we need to think of this as an event in and of itself. There were thousands of people who came to see this day after day after day. Family members consistently said they were as moved on that day, as they were on the day of the final selection. Here was evidence that people from all over the world put energy into the designs. The public display of these will be a memorial event in its own right.

Comment from Commissioner Nacke: The families in San Francisco asked if it would be a big event. And if it is, can we get that word out to the families as soon as possible so that families can make their plans.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: Don't forget that we have NPS carpenters, craftspeople and others, that can come down and help.

Question from Vice-Chair Glessner: Are you taking applications from people other than family members to be on the jury?

Answer from Helen Fried: We don't have a specific application form, but we are taking recommendations for others to serve on the jury.

Chairman Reynolds thanked Don and Helene for their tremendous work and for their comprehensive presentation.

Motion 04 17 Regarding the Design Competition Materials

The Commission endorses the design competition materials and their use in the competition.

Moved: Commissioner Catuzzi
 Second: Commissioner Sullivan
 Discussion from Commission:
 None
 Discussion from the Public:

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.
 Motion carries.

Motion 04 18 Regarding the Donations from the Heinz Endowments and the Knight Foundation

The Commission formally recognizes and greatly appreciates the Heinz Endowments grant of \$500,000 and the Knight Foundation grant of \$500,000 that will fund this competition and allow for the competition to begin on September 11. We are honored that these two foundations known for their philanthropic leadership and commitment to design excellence are supporting the effort to create a National Memorial in honor of the passengers and crew of Flight 93.

Moved: Commissioner Wilson
 Second: Commissioner Tokar-Ickes
 Discussion from Commission:

Chairman Reynolds read a formal and public acknowledgement of these donations into the record as follows:

“On behalf of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission and all of the partners, I would like to formally and publicly thank both the Heinz Endowments and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation for their generous grants of \$500,000 each, specifically for the design competition of the Flight 93 National Memorial. We are sincerely appreciative of their support in this extremely important project.

So far, the Flight 93 site in Shanksville has been the relatively “quiet” 9/11 site. This has served us well as we have designed and developed a solid administrative foundation for management of this highly complex public/private partnership. With the advent and the announcement of the design competition on September 11, 2004, however, Flight 93 will be brought into the forefront of the American public's attention. These grants have fortunately given us the opportunity to prepare well for this next step as we move into the next phase of project planning and development.

After an extensive search and interview process, we hired one of the top firms in the country to manage the design competition. Don Stastny of Portland, Oregon

and Helene Fried, of San Francisco, California collaborate on designing and managing complex design competitions which have included the Oklahoma City Memorial and the rebuilding of the Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Don and Helene bring a spirit of creativity, strong community involvement, and innovation to our project. But perhaps more importantly, they have established strong emotional bonds with the family members and the local community members in a short amount of time. They have gained the trust and respect of all of the partners working on this project.

Again, a formal thank you to Heinz Endowments and the Knight Foundation for their extreme generosity and their trust in us to manage the process to design a national memorial that will honor the heroism of the passengers and crew of Flight 93. The 9-11 Commission Report states that our country owes a debt of gratitude to the passengers and crew, for their actions helped save the lives of countless others, including avoiding the destruction of either the US Capitol or the White House. We will help to ensure that this memorial will speak to generations of Americans to come, so that we will never forget what happened on that fateful day.”

Discussion from the Public:

None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

Break for Lunch until 1:15 PM

Both Commissioner Watson and Commissioner Spangler were excused from the afternoon session of the Commission meeting. Commissioner Spangler is returning by 2:30 PM.

F. Fundraising Committee Update

Rick Stafford initiated the discussions on this update, and introduced Bob Carter, President of Ketchum, and Jason Zajac, Vice President of Ketchum.

Commissioner Reynolds first thanked Committee Chair Rick Stafford and the Funding Oversight Committee for their outstanding work.

Status reports were given on both Phase 1 and 2 of the feasibility process for fundraising.

Funding Study Progress: Phase One

- Briefings of Oversight Committee, Task Force, Families, and Commission
- Interviews with 24 representatives of Partners and/or concerned parties
- Benchmark research by Ketchum
- Report completed, reviewed by Oversight Committee and presented to Families
 - Message
 - Goal
 - Structure
 - Prospect Sources and Readiness

Funding Study Progress: Phase Two

- Preliminary Case for Support approved by Families
- Several hundred potential donors and/or leaders suggested as interview participants
- Oversight Committee classified suggestions and identified top 126 names
- Oversight Committee, Family members, Task Force members, and Commissioners asked to provide access where appropriate
- Web-based survey developed and launched
- Invitations for web survey sent to family members, Task Force, interested parties, and link posted on project and county web sites
- Ketchum participated in family meetings in San Francisco and New York areas
- Objective is to complete interviews with 60 - 75 of top 126 suggested candidates
 - 20 interviews completed
 - 9 interviews scheduled, not yet completed
 - 3 interviews cleared, but not yet scheduled
 - 2 suggested participants have declined to be interviewed
 - 30 individuals received general pre-interview letter, no personal contact
 - 62 interview candidates awaiting a pre-interview door-opening contact by a Partner representative

Interview Topics in Phase Two

- Need for National Memorial
- Plan for Memorial
- Personal philanthropic priority
- Role of public/private partnership
- Opinion re: state and federal support
- Opinion re: regional and national private support
- Themes for supporting Memorial
- Attainability of Goal
- Availability of very largest gifts
- Personal and/or corporate support
- Need for recognition, naming opportunities
- Willingness to work on campaign
- Willingness to lead campaign
- Economic implications
- Issues affecting timing

Challenges Encountered

- Obtaining from Partners suggestions for potential top-level donors and national campaign leaders
- Effort to have a person of national influence invite select individuals to participate in interviews
- Reaching consensus among Partners re: the Case for Support and its included project timeline and budget
- Obtaining clearances by Partner members for Ketchum to call upon personal contacts

Revised Timeline

- Interviews Completed and Analysis begins now 8/27; was 7/19
- First Draft of Report to Oversight Committee now 10/8; was 8/4

Final Report

- Purpose and Method
- Criteria for Success
- Findings and Analysis
 - Should there be a National Memorial
 - Understanding of the Need
 - Opinion of the Plan to Meet the Need
 - Appraisal of the Project
 - Appropriateness of a Campaign
 - Themes for the Memorial
 - Receptivity to a Private Sector Campaign
 - Attainability of the Goal
- Findings and Analysis
 - Availability of Standards of Giving
 - Willingness to Give: Personal and Corporate
 - Effect of Naming Opportunities
 - Willingness to Volunteer/Lead
 - Economic Outlook for Campaign
 - Proposed Timing
 - Recommendation to Proceed
- Observations
- Recommendations

Question from Commissioner Glass: Are you asking, in your interviews, what the preferences are for gifts for endowments (i.e. capital, education, endowment)

Answer from Jason Zajac: Yes. We are trying to determine both individually and collectively which audiences are receptive to which pieces of the project.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: There are still a lot of people that need to be contacted for interviews. Family members have said "use us" to make the calls, since they might have a higher likelihood of being listened to. If anyone is uncomfortable making the call to someone you know yourself, tell Ketchum or Rick, and a family member can call. If we miss 60 people for interviews, that is a lot of money.

Comment from Rick Stafford: The contacts are so essential to the future of our success. The database from all the conclusions comes from the interviews. We need the quality of interviews that will give us the answers to make capital campaign assumptions. If you have any outstanding contacts on which you have not followed through, please do so.. The database from all the conclusions comes form the interviews. We need more quality interviews OUTSIDE western PA.

Comment from Jason Zajac: Picking up on what Joanne said, if we miss 60 interviews, it is statistically about ½ of our sample, plus it is the best half of the sample, because those people have some, even if it is tenuous, connection to one of the partners and therefore to the event.

Question from Commissioner Wilson: From the studies so far, can you make an assessment of the population and the possibility of success?

Answer from Bob Carter: It really is too early to answer that. When you do a series of individual interviews it goes up and down. It is mixed right now, but no pattern that tells us anything either way.

Question from Sandy Felt, family member: Naming opportunities, can you clarify that for me? What are you naming?

Answer from Jason Zajac: Donors who are accustomed to high 6,7, and even 8 figure contributions, are accustomed to seeing their names on the side of hospital wings or facilities. So we are talking about what kind of recognition does a donor expect in the context of a national memorial and national park, where there are certain restrictions in naming. What are they looking for, without offering anything right now. Ketchum has done some research into donor recognition in several national parks that are tasteful, understated and respectful. There will probably be 8 – 10 overarching issues in the life of this campaign, that are big. One will be “who is the celebrity spokesperson?” “Who is the national working chair?” “How do we go about donor recognition” is another one. These will all have to be vetted by each partner organization, especially the families. But if the recognition is a driving force behind the gift, we need to come up with some good alternatives.

Comment from Rick Stafford: Just to reiterate, there is NO fundraising going on right now. NO commitments are being made. Nothing will happen until plan is vetted and approved.

Comment from Bob Carter: One thing that you should expect from fundraising counsel are recommendations on a gift acceptance policy. Then the partners should vet that.

Question from Sharon Dietrick: She had several of those contacts on which we are waiting. She had a three-fold question: 1) are the interview names anonymous and how is that guaranteed? 2) some of the prospects have said they already committed to giving, why do they need to meet with anyone, can they just send a check? And 3) she is concerned about giving access to some of her contacts. She does not want her friendship and relationship with her contacts jeopardized.

Answer from Rick Stafford: He set up 25 of those interviews and he was in a similar situation. He can absolutely guarantee that he knows nothing about what anyone said. This is a STANDARD of fundraising. We will not know what the interviewee said. The results are synthesized. NO ONE except for Ketchum will know what the interviewee said. If someone has already made a commitment, there is all the more reason for them to participate in the study so they can be “counted” in our results, and they can give us good answers to the questions on which we can make our capital campaign assumptions. They might also lead us further to others to interview. Rick has written or called each person himself and got an affirmative from all except 2. Then he told them Ketchum would call their office.

Question from Sharon Dietrick: Directly to Ketchum – if she gives them the name of someone that can make a very generous gift, is that relationship pursued after this project is done – and do they use it for other projects? Are her names put into a database for some other fundraising campaign?

Answer from Bob Carter: No, we do not. The 990 arena in corporate and foundation giving is in the public arena. Individual giving is private and anonymity is honored.

Comment from Sandy Felt: Can we make this broader in that not only will Ketchum NOT use phone number, contact, addresses of contacts – but the NPS/others will not use it.

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: No one else will have access to the list.

Question from Commissioner Catuzzi: Most of the names we have given to you are CEOs of major corporations. In your interviews, do you have the appropriate names of people with whom you will work with on a day-to-day basis?

Answer from Bob Carter: Yes, that is all part of the database. We only get one shot at the CEO. The next call will be to someone else in the organization. That is built in to the process.

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: He asked Sharon Dietrick if her questions were answered, particularly the one about one of her contacts wanting to give, but not being interviewed. They should just be able to give anyway.

Comment from Rick Stafford: If someone wants to give now but not be interviewed, they should be directed to Rick, not to Ketchum. He will follow up, but no one should try to talk someone into an interview.

Comment from Jason Zajac: There are two kinds of no. The first is no, because I don't want to. The second is no, because I don't understand why you would need to. If possible, we do want to interview them. We don't want them to arrive at a gift in a pre-emptive manner. If they learned more about the process, they may think about their gift differently, and change the amount. If we can understand what is inspiring that person, that can help us understand others.

Question from Sharon Dietrick: If someone just wants to make a gift, just give me something; some literature.

Answer from Rick Stafford: Really, they have to get in touch with someone. We have already had such people. Someone lets Rick know, and he gives the donor instructions so that it happens.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: She thanked Ketchum for their work, and said if there is anything they need us to do, they should let us know ASAP.

Comment from John Reynolds: Also would like to thank Rick, the families and the Commissioners for their work.

There was an announcement from John Reynolds before going on to the next update. Several people have come to this meeting wanting to make a presentation of their design for the memorial. He reminded everyone, that if a person makes a presentation now, it will not be eligible for the design competition because they will no longer be anonymous, and would not have followed the competition rules. If they do not want to be a part of the design competition, they will be given a 10-minute opportunity to do so in the public comment period of this meeting.

G. Archives Committee Update

Presented by Barbara Black

In August 2003, the Archives Committee of the Flight 93 Task Force recommended to the Task Force and the National Park Service that a position be created to coordinate the collection of "the individual stories, official records, the memorialization process and the administrative history of the creation of the memorial." The National Park Service provided funding for the position through a grant for fiscal year 2004 in the amount of \$50,000. In 2004, the National Park Service signed a Task Agreement with the Historical & Genealogical Society of Somerset County, Inc. to administer the project.

Status

Alexa D. Potter has been hired in the position of Oral History and Documentation Project Coordinator by the Historical & Genealogical Society and will begin the project on August 23, 2004.

The Project Coordinator will be a paid professional employee of the Historical & Genealogical Society of Somerset County, Inc. (HGSSC). The Project Coordinator will report to Barbara Black, Curator of the HGSSC, who is also the chair of the Archives Committee of the Flight 93 Task Force. Overall Charles Fox, Site Administrator of the Somerset Historical Center and Joanne Hanley, Superintendent of the Flight 93 National Memorial will provide project management.

The HGSSC solicited candidates for the position through historical and museum professional organizations, advertisements within the National Park Service and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, notices in the local community, and solicitations amongst the members of the Flight 93 Task Force. Interviews were conducted by the Personnel Committee of the HGSSC, which is composed of the President of the Society, Michael Hardwig, Society Vice-President George Kaufman, Society Past President Vernon Berkey, Somerset County Commissioner Pamela Tokar-Ickes, and Somerset Historical Center Site Administrator Charles Fox.

Ms. Potter has extensive experience in the collection of oral histories and archival documentation, having previously served as a research historian at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. She has also worked at the Prague Jewish Museum, the Terezin Memorial in Prague, the Erie Art Museum, and with the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission during her career. Alexa is a native of Erie, Pennsylvania, and is a graduate of St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota with a Masters Degree in History from the University of Pittsburgh. Ms. Potter is currently completing an internship with the Central Registry for Looted Art in London, England.

Immediate Next Steps

1. Coordinate and Collect Oral Histories

- Ms. Potter will be scheduled for training with the National Park Service to learn their methods for interviewing and managing the collected materials.
- Working with the Archives Committee, Ms. Potter will organize and prioritize individuals and organizations to contact for interviewing.
- Through the media, public announcements and personal invitation, Ms. Potter will recruit and train volunteers for the interviewing process.
- Ms. Potter will organize and match volunteers to interview individuals, and follow-up with volunteers for successful completion of the interviews.

2. Coordinate and Collect Official Records

- Ms. Potter will contact agencies, organizations and groups who were associated with the Flight 93 first response teams, investigation, and recovery efforts, and coordinate individual story collection and official record collection (as they become available on public record).
- All federal agency contact will be done through the Superintendent, Flight 93 National Memorial.

3. Coordinate the Collection of Media Records
 - Ms. Potter will coordinate the collection of Media Records with Jason Cohn, photojournalist in Pittsburgh, who has agreed to volunteer on behalf of the Flight 93 National Memorial Project as the Media Liaison.
4. Coordinate the Collection of Memorialization and Administrative History of the Creation of the Memorial
 - Ms. Potter will coordinate the collection of the stories and individuals involved in the creation of the first memorials, and collect minutes and records from the four partners involved in the creation of the memorial.

Barbara Black then presented a very moving and compelling power point presentation that depicted some of the personal stories, notes, and expressions that people leave at the memorial, using primary sources.

H. Temporary Memorial Management Committee Update

Presented by Donna Glessner

Visitorship Statistics

Since Memorial Day there has been a steady increase in visitors, beginning from 3,000 per week in early June to 5,000 per week in early July. Weekday totals are in the 400-500 range, while 1,000-1,500 visit on each of Saturday and Sunday. Ambassadors continue to staff the site from 10 AM to 6 PM on weekdays and from 10 AM to dark on weekends, with occasionally longer hours on holidays and when necessary to accommodate motorcoach trips. Five to seven motorcoaches per week have been visiting the site. Visitors continue to arrive from all over the world. During the month of June, for instance, visitors from 44 states and 14 foreign nations signed the tribute books at the site.

Volunteers

There are currently 43 Ambassadors volunteering at the site. We appreciate the assistance of a part-time NPS Volunteer Coordinator assigned to Flight 93. Diane Garcia has been working with the Ambassadors since May, providing training and advice (both directly and through a monthly newsletter), purchasing supplies, and staffing the Memorial on occasion. Currently, she is arranging for an Ambassador training trip to the Bruderhof community in Farmington, Pennsylvania. The Bruderhof is the group that is making the memorial benches at the site and has created a memorial in a renovated structure they call the "Peace Barn". We've been invited to use the Peace Barn for an afternoon training session. This trip is set for August 14. In June the Ambassadors spent an evening with Don Stastny and Helene Fried learning about the upcoming design competition. A training trip to Washington D.C. is planned for October or November.

Collections

Items continue to be brought into the Somerset Historical Center from the Temporary Memorial for conservation. All Ambassadors feel responsible for caring from the tributes at the site, and bringing in fragile items which should not be out in the weather. Chuck Wagner, in particular, makes sure that items are collected periodically, including the white comment cards where visitors can write their thoughts or messages and leave them in a locked box. Very thoughtful messages have been written on these cards, revealing the visitor's feelings about this site and this event.

Parking Lot/Memorial Improvement Project

This is the Federal Highway Administration-designed project described in previous briefings. Work on the parking lot was due to begin on September 13, but the status of the project is changing daily.

Joanne Hanley spoke more about the parking lot. She indicated we did not receive any bids, probably because the Request for Proposal was sent out in June 2004. June is an extremely busy time for contractors; they are working, not looking for work. There is one firm in Pittsburgh with whom Federal Highways is working on a negotiated bid process, but they are coming in way too high; higher than we are willing to pay for temporary facilities. Rather than rush and do it this year, and do it rather expensively, we are going to advertise again in January, and will ensure that it is hand delivered to local contractors, or put it in the papers.

Special Events/New Projects

On August 20 the temporary memorial will be the destination for an estimated 1,200 motorcycles registered for the 3rd "America's 9-11 Ride", a police-escorted, fundraising ride from Shanksville to New York City to Washington D.C. A smaller group of bikers will visit the site on August 19 for a simple ceremony and to present checks to volunteer fire companies who have assisted with the ride. On the morning of August 20 all 1,200 registered bikers will drive by the site.

The Ambassadors will be working with the Bruderhof group to refinish the wooden benches at the memorial and re-coat them with a dark paint and wood preservative, which, hopefully, will discourage graffiti-writers.

The Committee will work with appropriate officials to replace missing road signs, which direct visitors to the temporary memorial and work toward long-term improvement in the signage.

Donna closed her presentation by reading a quote from the Ambassador logbook, which was written by one of the Ambassadors after their shift one day:

"One visitor from Wisconsin gathered his family around, and asked me (the Ambassador) to tell the family why I volunteered here. It was a privilege to say because of the heroic acts of the passengers and crew who were instrumental in bringing the plane down here rather than in our nations capitol. They did what they could, and so some 40 if us do what we can. We volunteer."

I. Family Memorial Committee Update

By Ken Nacke.

Two family briefings were held as follows:

July 9 – 10, 2004 Fort Wadsworth Staten Island, NY

See attached agenda

In Attendance:

Christine Homer (Leroy Homer family)
 Esther Heymann (Elizabeth Wainio family)
 Christine Fraser (Colleen Fraser family)
 Mark Boyle (Colleen Fraser family)
 Kay Roy (Colleen Fraser family)
 Barbara Williams (Colleen Fraser family)
 Joy Stella (Colleen Fraser family)
 Mitch and Sherry Zykofsky (John Talignani family)
 Jerry Spangler
 Donna Glessner
 Jeff Reinbold
 Helene Fried from Stastny/Fried
 Don Stastny from Stastny/Fried
 Don Zeilstra from Ketchum
 Joanne Hanley

July 23 – 24

Presidio, San Francisco, CA

Report will be forthcoming at Commission meeting following upcoming meetings

Ken Nacke thanked Joanne Hanley, Jeff Reinbold, Jerry Spangler, Esther Heymann, Gina Farfour, Carole O'Hare, Catherine Miller, Don Stastny and Donna Glessner for taking the time to put together these meetings. Press conferences were also held in each location, planned at the last minute, but both of which went very well.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area Superintendent Brian O'Neill and his staff were also instrumental in helping us to bring our meeting to fruition at Fort Mason at the officers club, as well as the NPS staff at Fort Wadsworth on Staten Island. We would like to do something for them as a group.

Many of the family members spoke to the press in SFO after the press briefing, and everyone came together to talk about and stress the design competition and the memorial. The family members stepped up to the plate, and they sounded as one unified voice with a unified message.

Ken went on to talk briefly about the 4-pages of meeting notes that Derrill Bodley prepared from the SFO meeting. He also read the letter from Dorothy Garcia, which thanked everyone for the SFO meeting.

Joanne Hanley thanked Ken Nacke and his committee for organizing these family briefings. She said she could not go to SFO, but she indicated how proud she was of everyone and the job that was done. She indicated that Jeff said it best, that "when we

are sitting around the table you don't know whom belongs to what organization. That speaks volumes to our efforts." What a compliment.

Communications Committee Update

By Joanne Hanley

Joanne indicated that several people already discussed the press briefings held in NYC and SFO. She added that we will send a big thanks to the people at Fort Wadsworth, Gateway National Recreation Area, as well as at Golden Gate National Recreation Area for all of their support and pulling together to help us. They helped with the press briefings as well as with the family briefings. Joanne then passed around a copy of a "mini" RFP that was developed by the committee for the selection of a PR/Communications firm.

- A "mini" RFP for the communications/pr consultant has been prepared, reviewed, will be circulated to committee members, and will be available for discussion at the Commission meeting. Goals of consultant will include but not be limited to development of:
 - A communications and press strategy including outreach to different media markets, press conferences and press briefings for different stages and activities of the project; communications strategy for Congressional and Department of the Interior officials; and internal communications protocol.
 - messages for each stage of the project.
 - a unified delivery system for release of information to the public and the press; and
 - press materials.
- Joanne is working on obtaining funding, which must be secured prior to any hiring.
- Eight firms have been identified for their competency and reputation. Some will not be interested, but there have been at least a few who have expressed an interest.
 - Widmeyer; Washington DC and New York
 - Kelly & Salerno; New York
 - Fleischman Hillard; Washington DC
 - Mackenzie Communications; San Francisco
 - Jeanne Collins & Associates; New York
 - Dymun & Co., Pittsburgh, PA
 - Ketchum, New York
 - Burson-Marsteller, Pittsburgh, PA
- We are talking with Stastny/Fried for the feasibility of having the communications consultant be a subcontract to them. This will require some overhead for Stastny/Fried to manage. Stastny/Fried has some communications in their contract; this will help to integrate the entire pr/communications messaging.
- Tentative Process:
 - Obtain initial portfolios from interested firms
 - Send RFPs to each interested firm. (will be available for review at Commission meeting)
 - Oversight Committee rates each firm, checks references, and interviews (all quick turn-around)
 - Partner approvals.
 - Selection; funding secured; contract negotiated;

- Schedule: It would be ideal if the communications/PR firm could be on board by September 1, 2004. This will require a tremendous commitment of time and energy by a small group of individuals who are already committed on many other committees, tasks, and project deadlines. It will not be physically possible for the individuals who are on the committee to commit to yet another huge undertaking. That being said, Joanne Hanley will work on a solution to this.

Get the draft communications RFP back to Joanne with any comments. Getting a PR firm on board is PENDING obtaining funding.

Commissioner Pam Tokar-Ickes volunteered to be the Chair of the Committee, which is especially appropriate given her background.

Motion 04 19 Regarding the Communications Oversight Committee

The Commission concurs with the direction of the Communications Oversight Committee, and concurs with the hiring of a Public Relations/Communications consultant pending available funding. The Commission delegates authority to Pamela Tokar-Ickes as the Commission representative to the Communications Oversight Committee, to approve committee actions on behalf of the Commission.

Moved: Commissioner Larry Catuzzi

Second: Commissioner Calvin Wilson

Discussion from Commission:

Clarification from Joanne Hanley: This RFP will have to go back to all of the partners, including the families and partners.

Question from John Felt: Where will the consultants be based?

Answer from Chairman Reynolds: Wherever their home office is located.

Discussion from Public:

None

Vote: all in favor; none opposed.

Motion passes.

V. Old Business

Heinz History Center (HHC) Project; by Susan Hankinson

At the last Commission meeting in May, Andrew Masich invited us to participate in the Smithsonian exhibit, which the HHC is hosting in September. Susan has been working with Ann Fortescue, Director of Education, and will set up a conference call this coming week.

There will be a town meeting panel in which we will participate, to be held on September 22, 6:30 PM – 8:00 PM. Jeff or Joanne will participate for the NPS, but we will need other partners to participate.

Ms. Hankinson requested a moment from the Chairman to make a personal statement. She personally thanked everyone for his or her dedication. It has been an exciting day to see all of the work come together after three years. We have so many partners, yet we are all one working towards the goal. It is exciting and invigorating to move forward with more determination than ever. She thanks all of us for doing the best job we can.

Commissioner Glass mentioned that the Smithsonian exhibit about which Susan was talking is currently at the Japanese-American Museum in Los Angeles. They followed the beautiful Japanese tradition of placing folded birds in a vase at opening ceremonies.

Development Advisory Board by Joanne Hanley

Joanne Hanley and Jeff Reinbold went to the NPS Development Advisory in Denver earlier this week to present the project. The DAB is the construction oversight group composed of both senior NPS staff and outside advisors to the Director. They review all the development and construction projects over \$500,000 in the NPS. The DAB indicated that they would not get involved in any additional oversight approvals for the memorial, as they feel the partners, the Commission, the juries, the Secretary and Congress will have sufficient oversight in the process. They WILL however, be involved in the development of all the traditional facility development at Flight 93 as it occurs.

Review of Dates for 2005 Commission Meetings by Joanne Hanley

Deferred until the new item of business is brought up.

Update on SCA Position by Joanne Hanley

The NPS advertised for a full-time, one-year student intern through the Student Conservation Association. Nearly 30 people applied for the position; 10 were interviewed; the position was offered to four candidates, all of whom declined. This is primarily due to the small salary and stipend, and the fact that they were graduates, looking for full time professional jobs. If anyone knows anyone, please have him or her contact Joanne. There is still a good list from which to draw.

New Business

Proposed Recombination of Task Force and Commission Meetings

Joanne Hanley brought up the issue that had been raised by several Commissioners and task force members alike. It is extremely difficult and sometimes frustrating to sit through the same presentations during the confidential pre-briefings, then at the Commission meetings, then again at the task force meetings. Is there any way at all to combine commission and task force briefings?

It has become clear that the work of the commission and the work of the task force committees are sometimes indistinguishable. The following chart was presented as a starting point for discussion:

Friday Day	Optional Committee Meetings as Needed
Friday Night	Confidential Commission Pre-Briefings in Somerset or Optional Committee Meetings
Saturday AM	Task Force Meeting Briefings and Reports Shanksville 8:30 AM – 12:30 PM
Saturday Noon	Lunch and Break 12:30 PM – 2:00 PM
Saturday PM	Commission Meeting Deliberations and Votes Somerset, 2:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Discussion:

Comment from Joanne Hanley: We would have to advertise in the federal register that the briefings are in the morning, and the votes in the afternoon.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: He always thought it was a good idea to combine. It makes sense to have the task force meet first, hear the recommendations, and the commission debates and votes in the afternoon. The sequence is better and we would not have duplicative committee reports.

Comment from Commissioner Glass: He does not think that this combination gives recognition to the role of the Commission as a deliberative body and as the only official federal unit that is making the recommendation to the Secretary. The next few meetings will have major decisions and the meetings will become more and more intense in terms of the material being presented. Three hours on a Saturday afternoon may not give us enough time to carry out full responsibility.

Question from Commissioner Sullivan: Can the pre-briefings come in-between the Task Force and Commission meetings?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: There is nothing sacred about the order, but it may make for a long day. However, the pre-briefings are necessary (albeit confidential) background information for the public briefings. They are “pre” to the briefings for a reason.

Comment from Commissioner Glessner: We keep trying to fix this problem, and we have not found it yet.

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: She thinks there is a scheduling issue in that the spirit of the legislation, which was in its intent, to make sure that the work of the task force was strictly a ground up approach. The work of the Task Force is where most of the work has been done to date. We may be reaching a juncture where the role of the Task Force may be changing. It clearly was intended so that work could begin before the Commission was established. The heart of this process remains at the local, family community level. We have to keep that in mind in scheduling and making sure folks can attend.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: Personally, he thinks it is worth trying. We may need to massage it. He thinks the order is better, having the task force do its work and then report out to the Commission. The Commission will not be a rubber stamp; there has to be “meat on the bones” in the dialogue, and he thinks this can happen in 2 ½ to three hours after hearing all of the reports in the morning.

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: From the point of view of legislative intent, doing work - creating ideas - this seems to be getting towards that. All the work is getting done through committees. We may need to have more face-to-face committee meetings on Friday. That is the ultimate grass roots and it is where it all starts. We just need to figure out how to make it work.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: The only reason we have the reverse order was because we had the generosity of Shanksville schools to have it available on Saturday, and that was when most of the working people who were on the Task Force could attend.

Question from Sandy Felt: Do they need to change locations? Can everyone stay in Shanksville?

Answer from Joanne Hanley: We could. Some of the conversations that have come up are to retain the individuality of the Commission, have it in the formal office, thus making the distinction. Another issue that was heard, was the dwindling number of task force members who are attending the task force meetings. This is a major concern.

Comment from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: Most of the work it seems is being done by committee as opposed to being done at the task force level. As the continuum shifts to another stage in the process, maybe this needs to be another discussion at the task force level as well. Is it still a viable body? This is only a thought for discussion. It would be up to them.

Comment from Ben Wainio: He thinks the format of the task force probably has to change. In the beginning we were working, but now we have committees and phone calls, and go over things again and again. Maybe we need to change the format.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: Many of the Commissions with which the NPS works, do their work by subcommittees, operational committees. One of the nice things about the task force is that because it is independent, it does not give advice directly to the federal government but to the Commission, and because it is operations, it is not subject to FACA.

Comment from Sharon Dietrick: The task force has accomplished a lot through the committees. Wouldn't it make sense if we combined the meetings, and anyone who wanted to sit through this meeting could. Why can't we combine both?

Comment from Commissioner Spangler: We can combine the briefings, but the other parts are more formal and regulated.

Comment from Vice Chair Glessner: There are a number of people who come to the task force meeting on Saturday, who cannot come to the commission meeting on Friday. That is the beauty of the Task Force.

Question from Commissioner Tokar-Ickes: Do Task Force members still feel like they are making a contribution?

Answer from Vice-Chair Glessner: No, but committee members do. There will always be a need to go back to the pool of task force members to do future work. She doesn't think the work of the task force is done, but just needs a shot in the arm

Comment from Don Stastny: Please consider some things. Today is a watershed day in a lot of ways, i.e. approval of the design competition process, approval of the boundary, approval of the mission statement. Don and Helene also are changing their operations from advising on, to beginning to manage the design competition. Everything from this point on implements the planning. The decision-making structure that was put into place

to support the design competition has representatives from the 4 partners, INCLUDING the task force. All of it leads to coming to the Commission with final recommendations. It is very important to the design competition managers that the Commission has time, however the meetings are structured, to thoughtfully deliberate the important recommendations. Since the Commission is the only appointed body, it is the only one to whom decisions are brought. There must be enough time.

Comment from Commissioner Glass: Regardless of when we meet, the transition that is going on is moving from a volunteer effort to a more consultant-based effort.

Comment from Esther Heymann: We are about to start a new time that is very exciting, including the design competition. Task Force is an outreach – people coming together to get the job done.

Comment from Joanne Hanley: It would be good to have a better integration and organization of the two working bodies. But we also need to keep the identity of the grass roots organization. The beginning of the dialogue here today is a good thing because it is not only bringing up the schedule, but other underlying needs.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: Maybe we should reallocate the time for the grass roots meeting. Maybe the task force is the two-hour time. There may be ways of just picking those particular committees that need to report to the task force, and eliminate complete reporting of all committees to become more streamlined.

Comment from Commissioner Spangler: His view of the task force is that it serves two roles. First, it works through committees and there are opportunities for comments and concerns to be aired and answered. Second, for those items that require formal approval by the four partners, there would be formal votes.

Comment from Commissioner Wilson: The decisions that are made on the competition must go through all the partners. The task force was defined as one of the partners, and we need to be careful as to how that gets dissipated. The committees make up the task force, which is the official partner. The pulse and the energy of this movement originated with the task force, but as we move forward, we are now looking to re-harness that same energy i.e. volunteers for the design competition. It may appear as if decision-making has shifted from the Task Force; they started it, they got things organized, they got things started. Now that things are moving there may be some responsibilities pulling away from the task force individuals and they feel as if there might be no need of them anymore. That task force has been a foundation; so the foundation should not go away. Re-energize, re-task, re-define new tasks. When we say combine meetings, we should also be careful. The Task Force and Commission are not the same. They were not meant to be the same. They each have a different purpose and identity.

Comment from Commissioner Catuzzi: In a reallocation of time, why doesn't the task force meet from 8:30 AM – 10:30 AM with handpicked committee reports as necessary. They break and the Commission reconvenes for a lunch meeting, which is a pre-briefing for two hours. Then the Commission reconvenes from 1:30 – 5:00.

Comment from Commissioner Linenthal: Unless we can decide on this fairly soon, we should decide upon this in October. However, there is a rhythm to the way things are working. Work is getting done. Maybe, despite how we all feel, if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Comment from Chairman Reynolds: The evolution that seems to be taking place is the incorporation of the Commission as a partner to the original three. Much work was done in committees at that time. The committee structure has evolved to be a deliberative and decision-recommending body, which is doing most of the important work. But the Task Force is still the home of the Committees. We will discuss this further next time.

Dates for Remainder of 2004 and for 2005 Commission Meetings

October 22, 2004

January 14, 2005

April 15, 2005

June 24, 2005

August 19, 2005

September 2005 (Need a new date as opposed to 9/11 so as to not coincide with service)

VI. **Public Comment Period**

No public comments.

Meeting adjourned by Chairman John Reynolds.